THE
BULLETIN OF
Friends Historical Association

Vol. 38 Autumn Number, 1949 No. 2

CONTENTS

PAGE

QUAKER VISITORS TO AMERICAN PRESIDENTS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY ..... WILLIAM WISTAR COMFORT 63

DAVID HUDDLESTON: A PLAIN FRIEND AND HIS JOURNAL ..... OPAL THORNBURG 75

JOHN BRIGHT AND THE FACTORY ACTS: HUMANITARISM vs. *LAISSEZ FAIRE* ..... EDWIN B. BRONNER 92

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS —
William Penn to Thomas Lloyd ..... CARROLL FREY 103

QUAKER RESEARCH IN PROGRESS 109

NEWS OF THE ASSOCIATION 112

BOOK REVIEWS —
Ross, *Margaret Fell* ..... JANET WHITNEY 113
Brockbank, *Edward Burrough* ..... WILLIAM WISTAR COMFORT 115
Reynolds, *The Wisdom of John Woolman* ..... DAVID S. RICHIE 116
Lippincott, *A Narrative of Chestnut Hill,* D. ROBERT AND ELIZABETH YARNALL 118
Cameron, *Joseph Lister* ..... LOVETT DEWEES 119
Wright, *Sweeper in the Sky* ..... ROBERT J. LEACH 120
Whitney, *Geraldine Cadbury* ..... ANNA BRINTON 121

BRIEFER NOTICES 122

ARTICLES IN QUAKER PERIODICALS 127

OFFICERS OF FRIENDS HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

President: William Wistar Comfort
Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania

Vice-Presidents: Horace Mather Lippincott
Lydia Flagg Gummere

Secretary: Susanna Smedley
Westtown School, Westtown, Pennsylvania

Treasurer: William Mintzer Wills
Merion Gardens, Merion Station, Pennsylvania

Curator: Lydia Flagg Gummere
3026 Midvale Avenue, Philadelphia 29

Assistant Curator: M. Joseph McCosker
Atwater Kent Museum, Philadelphia 6

Editor of the Bulletin: Frederick B. Tolles
Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania

Assistant Editor: Anna B. Hewitt
Haverford College Library
Haverford, Pennsylvania

DIRECTORS

Elected at annual meetings held in 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Term expires 11 mo. 1949

Samuel J. Bunting, Jr.
William W. Comfort
Thomas E. Drake
Lydia F. Gummere
Anna B. Hewitt

Term expires 11 mo. 1950

Dorothy G. Harris
Horace Mather Lippincott
Susanna Smedley
William Mintzer Wills
Edward Woolman

Term expires 11 mo. 1950

C. Marshall Taylor
Frederick B. Tolles
Edward E. Wildman
H. Justice Williams

THE
BULLETIN OF
Friends
Historical Association

Vol. 38 Autumn Number, 1949 No. 2

QUAKER VISITORS TO AMERICAN PRESIDENTS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

By William Wistar Comfort*

THE motive which has impelled Friends to present their concerns to monarchs and national leaders from the time of Cromwell to the present time is well known. They felt that the way to secure moral and social reforms was to reach those in high places. Again and again Quaker delegations have brought personally before influential personages in England matters where Quaker testimonies were at stake. The same has happened in America in a considerable number of cases where Friends have approached the chief magistrate of the land. Some of those thus calling on the American President in the nineteenth century have been English traveling Friends and some of course have been Americans; some have been men and some women. But though practically all the interviews referred to below are already in print, I know of no effort to bring together a sufficient number of them to indicate the method of procedure and the spirit in which such interviews progressed. The list makes no claim to completeness. It has been compiled from my own casual reading and from the suggestions of friends; others may

* William Wistar Comfort, President of Friends Historical Association, is the author of many books on Quaker history, including *Stephen Grellet*, and *William Penn: A Tercentenary Estimate.*

supplement it from their own knowledge. But enough will be said to indicate the interest of these episodes in the lives of the participants.

My friend John V. G. Forbes points out that slightly before the opening of the nineteenth century General Washington during the Revolution and later as President had interviews with that doughty Friend Warner Mifflin, in which the Quaker presented the Society's testimony against the spirit of war.[1]

In 1789 George Washington had occasion to make an interesting reply to an address from Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, in which he said (*inter alia*): "Your principles and conduct are well known to me; and it is doing the people called Quakers no more than justice to say, that (except their declining to share with others the burthen of the common defence) there is no denomination among us, who are more exemplary and useful citizens.

"I assure you very explicitly, that in my opinion the conscientious scruples of all men should be treated with great delicacy and tenderness; and it is my wish and desire, that the laws may always be as extensively accommodated to them, as a due regard to the protection and essential interests of the nation may justify and permit."[2]

John Forbes also calls my attention to the visit of Jesse Kersey of Chester County, Pennsylvania, to President Jefferson in Sixth Month, 1808, in Washington relating to slavery. The President, as reported by Kersey, "remarked that he had thought of the plan of removing the slaves to Africa as contemplated by Paul Cuffee; but many objections had occurred to him against it. He had also thought of their being colonized: but in this, difficulties also presented. In fact, difficulties would present in every plan that could be taken up. He said the only probable method that he could see, to remedy the evil,—would be for the different States of the Union to be willing to receive them; and

[1] *Life and Ancestry of Warner Mifflin*, compiled by Hilda Justice (Philadelphia, 1905), pp. 74-75, 158.

[2] *The Writings of George Washington*, ed. John C. Fitzpatrick (Washington, 1931-44), XXX, 416n.

thus they would be spread among the industrious and practical farmers, and their habits, education and condition would be improved. I felt a satisfaction that the subject had engaged his attention, and parted with him in an agreeable manner."[3]

The same Friend relates that during the war of 1812 he called on President Madison in Washington "and mentioned to him how affecting it was to contemplate the condition of the inhabitants along the frontiers of our country, exposed as they were to the sound of the instruments of death. He seemed to feel the weight of my concern for the return of peace to our land."[4]

In 1824 John Quincy Adams reports that "three Quakers came as a deputation from a society of their persuasion to express to the Government their great anxiety for the suppression of the slave trade. They had been with the President [Monroe], who had requested them also to see me." They inquired if some representations could not be made to the French Government to take measures for putting down this iniquitous traffic. Adams continues: "I told them what had been done, and what I hoped might yet be done, in negotiation with the maritime powers, and promised them all the aid I could give them for the accomplishment of their purpose."[5]

In 1827 this same Adams, now President himself, received a visit from that indefatigable traveler Thomas Shillitoe, who gives us a lengthy account of his interview, from which a few extracts will suffice. In the happy days when Presidents were not so busy, it was possible for Adams to inform Shillitoe that "he was at liberty to receive me at such time as best suited myself [!]" "Received in a kind, respectful manner, I presented him with my certificates, which he appeared to read with attention." Like Stephen Grellet, Shillitoe found that this

---

[3] *A Narrative of the Early Life, Travels, and Gospel Labors of Jesse Kersey* (Philadelphia, 1851), p. 74.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 195.

[5] *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, ed. Charles Francis Adams (Philadelphia, 1874-77), VI, 375.

practice of submitting testimonials saved much time and some useless questions. Two matters were upon the visitor's mind. First, to obtain State aid for two aged and infirm women, daughters of the old chief of the Oneida tribe, Scannadore, "who, when living, was highly respected by those who were of influence in Congress, for his piety, uprightness of conduct, and great powers of mind," who were now forced to beg their food from this tribe who were as poor as themselves. "He assured me it should obtain his attention." Shillitoe's other concern was about intemperance caused by the retail sale of spirituous liquors in grocers' shops in American cities. Son of a London pub-keeper himself, Shillitoe was on firm ground in presenting the dangers to which patrons were subjected in thus finding liquor available in grocery shops. He embraced the opportunity for a little preachment touching upon the President's responsibility: "I recommended the president to lay the subject before the members of congress, and by so doing, if he could do no more than this towards endeavouring to remove this great evil, I believed he would find peace in so doing . . . I feared the people of the United States had forgot again that Almighty hand which had brought about their deliverance from the warfare they had been involved in; and that it was my belief, if wickedness continued to increase in the United States as it had done, a scourge in some way or another would again be permitted to come upon the people of the United States of America . . . ." At parting, "the president expressed the satisfaction our visit had afforded him; in which we felt cause to unite, in that he had given us such a full opportunity to relieve our minds."[6]

It might be expected that such a distinguished Englishman as J. J. Gurney would receive a cordial welcome in Washington, where he visited twice, in 1838 and 1840, and held two meetings for worship by appointment in the halls of Congress. He met repeatedly J. Q. Adams, Webster, Calhoun, Forsyth (Secretary of State), Henry Clay, and President Van Buren himself. The subjects of conversation were the slave trade and treatment of

---

[6] *Journal of the Life, Labours, and Travels of Thomas Shillitoe* (London, 1839), II, 260-61.

the Indians. Gurney was just fifty years old, in the prime of his age and virile beauty. He has left a rich account of his meetings with the leaders in Congress. After talking with J. Q. Adams about slavery, he continues: "On a subsequent morning, at the early hour of nine o'clock, we were introduced to Martin Van Buren, the President, a gentleman of great affability and ease of manner, with much acuteness, and I think, benevolence also marked on his countenance. During our short interview, the subjects of our conversation were the African slave-trade, and the claims of the native Indian tribes; on both which topics he spoke with a good deal of firmness. It was my endeavour to impress on the mind of the President, the vast importance of the cordial co-operation of America with the European powers, in the suppression of the slave trade, on the perfectly reasonable principle of a mutual right of search, a principle which surely ought not to offend the pride of any one nation. But the Americans are a community of kings, every man his own ruler, and they shrink from the very notion of indignity. Thus I fear they are but too likely to persist in sacrificing the interests of humanity, to what is falsely regarded as national honour."[7] A year later, Gurney met Van Buren again while traveling from New York to Philadelphia. The President recognized him and they discoursed of the daily use of the Bible in the schools, of mildness in prison discipline, the African slave trade, American slavery, the voluntary system in religion, of Wilberforce, Fowell Buxton, and Elizabeth Fry with whose character and objects Van Buren "was well acquainted." Still later, in 1840, Gurney had at least two more visits with President Van Buren, talking of the slave trade and the condition of the Negroes in Cuba and Jamaica, which he had just visited.

Among the Friends who sought an interview with a President, Joseph Sturge alone seems to have failed in 1841. He says he tried to present a memorial on slavery to President Tyler, but received no reply to his request. He later met Tyler who "made no allusion to it, or to my letter to himself." He did, however,

[7] *Memoirs of Joseph John Gurney*, ed. J. Bevan Braithwaite (Philadelphia, 1854), II, 118-19.

see J. Q. Adams, then ex-President, and found him an ardent anti-slavery man and against Gag Law. As was his custom, Adams "received us very kindly."[8]

This same President Tyler was visited by James and Lucretia Mott in 1843. In a letter of Lucretia's dated Second Month 14, 1843 she says: "I told him 'a part of my mission was to interest those in power on the subject of emancipation.' He professed some interest in the subject, but thought the blacks should be colonized. James told him that the South could not do without them, and he thought they should be left free to choose their location, as other people were. He asked if we would be willing to have them at the North. I replied, 'Yes—as many as incline to come, but most of them would prefer to remain on the plantations, and work for wages.' He spoke of the discussions of the subject years ago in Virginia, 'but the Missouri question and other agitations had put the cause back.' I hoped it was not too late to resume it. He liked the way Friends treated the subject; he had lately read the address from Baltimore; and liked it. I did not—it was calculated to set the slave-holder's conscience too much at ease—it made more apology for him, than he could make for himself. He replied, 'I should like to hand Mr. Calhoun over to you.' On our coming away, he wished me success in my benevolent enterprises."[9]

President Tyler's alleged interest in African colonization was shared by many men in public life and even by some Friends. The plan was opposed, however, by most ardent abolitionists.

Early in 1846 William Forster wrote to his son from Washington: "On Fourth-day morning we paid a visit to the President [Polk]; he received us with much politeness, and allowed us ample opportunity to speak to him upon subjects pressing upon our minds.

"Our other engagements have been principally in conversational visits upon slavery to senators from the Southern States.

---

[8] Joseph Sturge, *A Visit to the United States in 1841* (London, 1842), pp. 79-80.

[9] Anna Davis Hallowell, *James and Lucretia Mott* (Boston, 1884), p. 238.

It was a little service to which my mind had been drawn for several weeks; and I cannot but feel very thankful that the way has thus far opened for us."[10]

During his long life of interest in the Indians, Thomas Wistar, Jr. of Philadelphia had frequent occasion to negotiate with United States commissioners and agents. In his MS diaries in the Haverford College Library[11] he thus describes his two meetings in 1849 with President Taylor regarding his disbursement of certain payments of the Government to the Indians: "During my first interview with the President in company with Secretary Meredith at the White House I was almost tempted to uncover my head out of respect to him and the great men there present. But *great* was my peace in maintaining our testimony and great was the benefit I gained. For at this time I was not aware he had expressed to Meredith his wish to have a man to make the payment who feared God but not man. Although my hat was on my head, my hand was enclosed in both of his while expressing his obligation for my willingness to go on the mission [to Green Bay, Wisconsin]. After my return and when informing him that I had paid the Indians and had several hundred dollars remaining, he said 'I thought your purse would be like the widow's cruse, not easily emptied!' and added that if the judgment of God fall on this land it would be for our wrong to the Indians."

In 1853 three women Friends accompanied Elizabeth Newport, a minister from Philadelphia, upon "a visit in the love of the Gospel" to President Pierce. It was soon after the death of the President's only son and he explained the absence of his wife on this account. A solemn religious "opportunity" opened the meeting during which Elizabeth encouraged the President to be obedient to the gospel principles and to those stirrings of the grace of God which she believed he had experienced as a child and which he was now called upon to manifest in the responsible position he occupied. "She adverted briefly to the evils of war

[10] *Memoirs of William Forster*, ed. Benjamin Seebohm (London, 1865), II, 200.

[11] Vol. I, p. 87.

and slavery" and then tenderly expressed her sympathy for the bereaved parents in their recent loss.

Perhaps the President's attentive attitude may be more particularly mentioned. He "soon fixed his eyes on the floor, and at times manifested his emotion by tears. After a moment's pause, he replied nearly as follows: 'Madam, I am not a professor of religion, but I can acknowledge the truth of much that you have expressed. It is true, as you suggest, that from a child I have been impressed with the sacred truths of religion, and though I may not have regarded them, I can assure you it is my firm belief, that there can be no permanent reformation, either in an individual or a people, that is not founded upon the obligations of civilization and Christianity. You refer to the difference of our positions in life. I feel there is none; and as you have kindly addressed me as your brother, I can in return call you my sister.

" 'The responsible position I now occupy is not one of my seeking, or my choice. I feel that it is a path surrounded by thorns, and can assure you I would gladly escape from it. Nothing, nothing, that surrounds me here can soothe the agonies of my crushed heart. You have adverted to the subject of war, and let me assure you that I regard it as totally inconsistent with every principle of humanity. . . . My father was a soldier of the Revolution. He taught me when a child, that it was my duty to defend the honor and glory of my country; but, in the war with Mexico, I was never upon a battle-field that my eyes were not suffused with tears; and let me assure you that, as far as my influence extends, it shall be exerted to avert the terrible evil of war, which should never be resorted to but in the last extremity. You allude also to slavery; upon that subject I am a northern man with northern feelings, but I find at the foundation of the government, our fathers recognized this as one of the compromises of the Constitution, and I am bound by my obligations to maintain it. It can only be abolished through the influence of moral power, or of revelation upon the mind. You speak of our great bereavement, and for your kind feelings of sympathy, let me assure you I thank you from my heart.' " The Friends left a loving message for his wife and as they passed

from the room the President extended a cordial invitation for them or any of their friends to visit him again.[12]

The War between the States raised issues in which the Friends were vitally concerned. The first delegation of which I know, and which the Editor of our BULLETIN kindly pointed out to me, consisted of Francis T. King and James Carey who carried to Lincoln from English Friends a memorial regarding the Mason and Slidell incident in 1861. Senator Sherman served as their introducer and they found the President "sitting before an open wood fire, in a large easy chair, with that sad, yet strong countenance, which, once seen, was never forgotten. He rose and shook hands with us cordially, and readily assented to our reading the paper from England, to which he listened attentively. In making a few remarks, we stated that the appeal would have the support of able Friends in Parliament, among whom was John Bright. The President's countenance lightened up at the mention of that name, and turning to the senator he said, 'Sherman, did you know that John Bright was a Quaker?' 'Oh, yes!' 'Well, I did not before. I read all his speeches, and he knows more of American politics than most of the men at the other end of the avenue (pointing towards the Capitol). I appreciate his great work for us in our struggle at home. . . . These are the first words of cheer and encouragement we have had from across the water.' "[13]

There is an account, somewhat garbled, but apparently true in essence, of a visit by a man and his mother named Harvey (not Haddam), Quakers from Ohio, to Lincoln in 1862. Under a concern regarding slavery, in great trepidation they penetrated to the President a few days before the Emancipation Proclamation was issued. The content of their conversation is not revealed, but the thought that the President's intention may have taken shape partially as a result of this call is an interesting one.[14]

---

[12] *Memoir of Elizabeth Newport,* compiled by Ann A. Townsend (Philadelphia, 1874), pp. 210-17.

[13] Fernando G. Cartland, *Southern Heroes; or, The Friends in War Time* (Cambridge, 1895), pp. 8-9.

[14] *Harper's New Monthly Magazine,* XLI, 537-51.

More authentic is the visit in 1864 of Elizabeth Comstock. Born in England in 1815, she died at Union Springs, N. Y., in 1891. A visitor to the military hospitals and deeply concerned for the "contrabands," she came to the White House in company with Joseph Grinnell and Mary Bradford. The call lasted only twenty minutes and was opened with a solemn silence followed by a short message from the ninth and tenth verses of the forty-first chapter of *Isaiah.* "A season of prayer followed. The chief magistrate of this vast Republic was on his knees beside us, bowed before 'the King eternal, immortal, invisible.' . . . When we rose from our knees, and were about to leave, the President shook hands with me very cordially; he stood some minutes with my hand grasped in both of his, and thanked me for my visit, and spoke something to this effect, that he entirely agreed with me in my sense of the over-ruling power and supremacy of our Heavenly Father. 'Perhaps there is no position like mine, and no man living better able than myself to recognize the necessity of Divine guidance, Divine grace, or to see the hand of the Lord in the great events that are now transpiring.' " Upon leaving, the Friends asked for a flower from a vase nearby, and were given liberty to help themselves.[15] Apparently, Lincoln was willing to follow such visits with a message of appreciation, as he did in this case and later, after Eliza Gurney's famous visit. Elizabeth Comstock, however, was not done with Presidents. In 1881 she visited Garfield with Augustus Taber and wife and Edward Tatum and wife. The President received the Friends in his library "and devoted half an hour to the discussion of the exodus and refugees. He expressed lively interest in the freedmen, and a determination to do all in his power for them." She had well in hand her plan for the education and improvement of the freedmen, and presented her plan under four points.[16] Two weeks later the President was shot in the station at Washington.

Best known of Quaker visits to Lincoln is that of Eliza P. Gurney, third wife and now widow of Joseph John. After his

[15] *Life and Letters of Elizabeth L. Comstock,* compiled by C. Hare (Philadelphia, 1895), pp. 179-81.

[16] *Ibid.,* pp. 423-24.

death, she returned to her native land and lived near Philadelphia. Accompanied by friends, her concern, like that of Elizabeth Comstock, was of a religious nature. The interview in 1862, with its period of quiet worship, is recorded from memory by one of those present with her. Her message assured the President of sympathy with him under his heavy responsibility and directed him to the Source of strength and support. In reply, Lincoln said: "I have desired that all my words and actions may be in accordance with His will; but if, after endeavoring to do my best with the light which He affords me, I find my efforts fail, then I must believe that, for some purpose unknown to me, He wills it otherwise." Later, in a letter now preserved in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Lincoln recalled the visit of Eliza Gurney and said that he probably should never forget "the very impressive occasion when yourself and friends visited me on a Sabbath forenoon two years ago."[17]

Joseph S. Elkinton tells of a visit in 1898 to ex-President Cleveland in Princeton, in which he refers to an earlier interview with him about Indian affairs. He now expressed his satisfaction with the ex-President's published desire that there should be a peaceable settlement of the Cuban question. They talked of Indians and of war and then J.S.E. records: "I expressed my desire that he would continue to exercise his influence on the side of peace, and then addressed him in a religious manner. . . . On my way out I met with the wife and children of Grover Cleveland, and had a pleasant little conversation with them." In 1903 he visited Theodore Roosevelt who recognized him in his hearty fashion as one whom he had seen before: " 'Well, Friend Joseph, I am very happy to see thee, how is thee?' . . . On his asking what he could do for me, I responded, 'Watch over the Indians for good.' He replied, 'I will' "[18]

In 1904 Edward Grubb of England "went to Washington, where he had a short interview with the President, Theodore Roosevelt, at the White House. He says, amusingly, that the

---

[17] *Memoir and Correspondence of Eliza P. Gurney*, ed. Richard F. Mott (Philadelphia, 1884), pp. 307-18.

[18] *Selections from the Diary and Correspondence of Joseph S. Elkinton* (Philadelphia, 1913), pp. 375-76, 447-48.

interview was less formal than a visit to one's bank manager in England. He thanked the President for the stand he had taken for justice, especially on behalf of the coloured people: to which the President replied: 'I have always had a strong sympathy with the American humorist who said it was much easier to be a wise dove than a harmless serpent. I have done my best with this problem, but it is a very hard one.' "[19]

By thus confining ourselves practically to the nineteenth century, we have seen how Friends laid siege to American Presidents. The interviews described here were not only those of official delegations sent by Yearly Meetings, but more often arose from personal concerns regarding peace, slavery, treatment of the colored people and Indians, prison reform and temperance—all time-honored objects of Quaker interest. The visits appear to have been carried off with satisfaction. The Friends succeeded in conveying their sympathy and prayerful support for those in high places of responsibility. They performed their duty in much the same way that Stephen Grellet and William Allen did in their interviews with the great ones of Europe early in the nineteenth century. Perhaps part of the good feeling which prevailed was due to the fact that, like Cromwell after an interview with George Fox, the Presidents felt that here at least were visitors who wanted nothing for themselves and who could not be won "either with gifts, honours, offices, or places." Among the ordinary run of place-seekers and tuft-hunters, such callers might well be welcome.

---

[19] James Dudley, *The Life of Edward Grubb* (London, 1946), p. 84.

DAVID HUDDLESTON
A PLAIN FRIEND AND HIS JOURNAL

By Opal Thornburg*

READERS of *The Friend* (Philadelphia) in the decade 1880-90 were well acquainted with the name of David Huddleston of Dublin, Indiana, whose articles and poems on religious topics appeared at frequent intervals. *The Friends Review* (Philadelphia) and *The British Friend* (Glasgow) occasionally published such articles by him, and even *The Western Friend* (Baxter Springs, Kansas) and *The Christian Worker* (Chicago), although the two last named were less receptive because of differences in views.

An editorial in *The Friend* by Joseph Walton soon after David Huddleston's death stated, "He bore a faithful testimony against the departure from [Friends] principles, which, of latter time, have received the countenance of so many of its members. A few years before his death he twice attended Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, and visited considerably among Friends in these parts. The humility, tenderness of spirit, and sweetness of disposition which he then manifested, endeared him to many."[1]

But the most valuable of David Huddleston's writings have never been published except a small portion which appeared recently in this Bulletin.[2] Their very existence has been unknown until three years ago except by members of his family. These writings consist of twenty-eight small notebook journals beginning on Tenth Month 6th, 1872 and extending almost to the last week of his life, Ninth Month 23rd, 1890, when he was ninety years old. All but nine of these manuscripts are now at Earlham College, partly by gift and partly on deposit, and it is

---

* Opal Thornburg is Executive Assistant to the President of Earlham College.

[1] *The Friend*, 64 (1890), 96.

[2] "A Visit to Earlham in 1884," edited by Opal Thornburg, Bulletin of Friends Historical Association," 36 (Autumn, 1947), 78-79.

hoped that the remaining books, still in the possession of two of his descendants, will eventually be available to complete the collection.

David Huddleston was not unaware of the value of his journal, for two years before his death he made this entry:

> Today I wrote an agreement consigning my numerous writings to Albert's[3] care & disposal after I am done with them. But to be left for use if any competent one should be found willing to compile a publication from them & then return the original to Albert.[4]

Like so many of his generation, David Huddleston was largely self-taught. His books were the Bible, the writings of George Fox, Robert Barclay, and other early Friends, and his periodicals were the Friends publications and the Richmond and Dublin newspapers.

His journal consists largely of his reactions to happenings in the Friends Meeting at Dublin and elsewhere, accounts of incidents illustrating the testimony he bore, and what he thought of the state of the Society. The value of the journal consists in its intimate picture of Midwestern Quakerism as seen by one who was deeply concerned over the widespread departure, not only in America but in England and Ireland, from what he believed to be the true faith of Friends.

Since David Huddleston was already an old man when he began his journal at the age of 71, and since it was never his intention to relate his personal history, the events of his life are revealed only by chance references. He was born of Quaker parents in North Carolina on the 6th of Tenth Month, 1801, the eldest of a family of thirteen children. His parents, caught up in the great Quaker migration to the Northwest Territory, moved when he was young to Union County, Indiana, near Salem, a

---

[3] Dr. Albert Huddleston, physician in Winchester, Ind., a grandson of David Huddleston. On the death of Dr. Huddleston the manuscripts came to his daughter, Ina Huddleston Oler, Richmond, Indiana, who distributed them to interested members of the family and later reassembled them for deposit at Earlham College, with the exception of six given to Earlham directly by Dorothy Walton Ronald, Richmond, and nine still in the possession of others.

[4] *Journal*, 11/19/88.

Quaker settlement southeast of Liberty. As a young man he helped to clear his father's farm. About 1827 he built the house near Salem where he and his wife, Elizabeth Powell, lived for over forty years and where their eight children were born. A journal entry on the 27th of First Month, 1880, during a visit to Salem, told of a walk across the fields "back to Eliza's[5], passing over the spot where I, before we were married, shot a wild turkey that weighed 18 pounds."

On another visit to Salem that same year he wrote ". . . took a walk of a mile up the branch that my father first settled on; and in the same woods & over the same road that my wife & I used to ride a horseback to Silver Creek meeting over 50 years ago."[6]

For many years, while living near Salem, David served as secretary for Elk Friends Meeting.

In 1868 David and Elizabeth moved to a small plot of land they had bought near Dublin, some thirty miles away. In 1880, while revisiting Salem, he made this entry:

> With Sam[1] Fry took a walk over our old place & admired the beautiful cultivated fields, kept in excellent order, but felt no regret at having left as I believe we are in our right place at Dublin & that the right time had come for us to leave the busy cares of life for younger hands & for us to spend our evening days in a more retired and religious way.[7]

David Huddleston's main business was that of a nurseryman. Until the last ten years of his life he dealt mostly with fruit trees—cherry, apple, pear, quince, plum, persimmon. When he was 78 years old he wrote:

> Now, as age advances, I feel as if the time had come for me to quit fruit tree growing. I still have a few hundred of grafted pear trees on hand, large enough for sale. When they are gone, shall aim to wind it up & feel, I hope, comfortably released from the tree business, not expecting to graft any more for myself. Four years ago this spring there was a strawberry plant came up in my nursery to which I gave attention. It appeared to be from the seed of the Wilson, with a mixture

---

[5] His daughter Eliza, who married first John Davis and second Henry Pickett in 1880, moving to Darlington, Indiana.

[6] Journal, 11/13/80.

[7] Journal, 2/24/80.

of Agriculturist, when it fruited, & has since turned out so well as to receive a pretty wide spread fame. The demands for plants seem to be increasing. I look upon it as having been Providentially given for my help & passtime now in old age. The propagating & selling plants being light work in comparison to handling trees, as they root deep, & are hard to dig.[8]

This strawberry plant he named Huddleston's Favorite. When the State Horticultural Society met at Dublin on Twelfth Month 16th, 1879 he read a paper on the origin and development of this strawberry.

In the Dublin Friends Meeting, David was a power to be reckoned with. While his unpopular views as to the true faith prevented his selection as an elder, he served at times on the Elders' Committee, and sometimes attended Select Meeting by invitation. At Yearly Meeting in Richmond on Ninth Month 24th, 1880 he "sat with the ministers and Elders for the first time in my life." His usual place in Dublin Meeting was third from the head, though he often had the first seat.

Although Dublin Meeting looked on Uncle David with affection and accorded him a place of honor commensurate with his age and his integrity, they would have none of his views. Under the influence of the teaching of Cleveland Bible Institute and similar training schools, Midwestern Friends had become ultra-Evangelical, looking to the Scriptures as the highest authority rather than to the Inward Light, following a program and method closely resembling that of Methodists and other evangelical faiths. In the 1880s Dougan Clark, head of the Biblical department at Earlham College, was teaching an extreme Holiness religion. The great separations among Friends had occurred in the second quarter of the century, and Dublin Meeting had long since set its course according to the newer doctrines of the "fast Friends," but David Huddleston was still fighting for a return to the unprogrammed meeting, free of "creaturely activity." David's neighbors were "generally looking on me as a disorderly *Wilber*, as I think some of them call me."[9]

---

[8] Journal, 8/18/79.

[9] Journal, 9/7/84.

But David was entirely unconcerned about the label which might be applied to him. Come what may, he stood unalterably against the "noisy" meeting, mourners' benches, prayer meetings, revivals, singing, testimonies, Bible reading in meetings rather than dependence on the promptings of the Holy Spirit, and the use of the Doxology. A characteristic entry in his journal ran thus:

> At 7½ another Meeting, not so satisfactory. A good deal of singing, & a good deal of urging for confessions. Several of the gaudy ones professed perfect peace with God. It held till 10. I should have felt more in my place at home.[10]

To him the singing was particularly exercising. A meeting was bearable in inverse proportion to its number of "spells of loud singing," as he usually referred to them, a mark of "the natural man." From time to time he recorded:

> The house rang like a Methodist meeting.
>
> O. White and the rest of our singers absent, so more silent waiting than usual. Quite a treat !
>
> . . . more discouraging in the way of singing. Wm. H. & his boy of 8 or 10 had 2 spells with their books open. He learning his boy, who sang all the time.

Even when, in his last years, he became too deaf to hear the music, David was still disturbed: "Singing was commenced & participated in by quite a number, as appeared by the mouths that were in motion."

A meeting particularly distasteful to him was one when the program included "4 young men of the Young Men's Christian Association, each with mustash, song-book, and Bible."[11]

Concerning a Quarterly Meeting in Richmond, David wrote:

> Near the close of the men's meeting today the subject of singing & reading in our M's was brought to view by Dr. D. Clark & largely encouraged by him, J. Dickinson & some others, the drift of expression being mainly in that direction. The dissenting ones being mostly in desponding silence, being overwhelmed by the preponderating influence against us, cast down, but I hope not in despair . . . I believe that when the present modified Quakerism that now appears to receive so warm a welcome amongst us, or when it has gone the length that is designed for it to go by Him who can say "thus far shalt thou go and no farther"

---

[10] Journal, 9/5/74.
[11] Journal, 8/23/79.

it will die. I was tried whether to speak or not, but finally feared that the qualifying power was not sufficiently felt to justify it.

And at that point in the journal appeared a stanza which David quoted again and again, of which perhaps he himself was the author:

> Our church as now is in a wintry state,
> Her barrenness & poverty are great.
> I've seen the desolation long ago
> And silently have mourned because 'twas so.[12]

The manner of speaking in meeting was a subject of frequent comment in the journal:

O. White delivered a lengthy & boisterous discourse.

J. Taylor first spoke in a ranting stile, walking the house.

J. Taylor on the same line, using a great deal of animal warmth. He spoke loud and lengthy, & like an empty waggon made a good deal of noise.

The "empty wagon" simile following David home and his entry for that day closed thus:

After getting home the following language presented to mind:

> An empty waggon passing by
> Makes far more noise, none can deny,
> Than one that's loaded down with worth
> And makes impression on the earth,
> That marks the road we seek to go,
> Though far more quiet and more slow.[13]

David Huddleston recognized that the drift away from the Quietism he loved was widespread. Recording a temperature of minus one on a morning in Second Month, he added, "and Quakerism as well as the mercury low." Commenting more specifically:

Got the *Christian Worker*[14] for last week & looked it pretty well through. Enough to confirm me in the belief that old fashioned Quakerism is about dead & gone in most of our Western meetings, and a formal paid & educated ministry taking the place & largely prevailing.[15]

---

[12] Journal, 6/5/80.

[13] Journal, 10/29/87.

[14] After *The Friends Review* in 1871 began to oppose the pastoral system, *The Christian Worker* was inaugurated in Chicago as an expression of the revival movement.

[15] Journal, 3/20/88.

Three months before his death he wrote:

Read more in the B[ritish] F[riend]. It contains the accounts of Ireland or Dublin & London Y.M.s, full & interesting. Some of it a little encouraging. But much of it showing the sad effects of apostate Quakerism that seems to have levened the whole lump, or perhaps I should say, the whole of Christendom at large.[16]

The Huddleston journal is rich in incidents which throw light on his nature and that of the community. Addressing the Horticultural Society in Cambridge City on Sixth Month 12th, 1874, he endeavored "to show that the annual pests which annoy the gardner and farmer are the effects of disobedience and sin, or in other words are the consequence of the curse pronounced on the ground for the original transgression of man, and that now since the fall we have to eat of the fruit of it in sorrow and in the sweat of our face all the days of our lives."

On a visit to his daughter Martha's family near Thorntown he went with them to Walnut Grove meeting and Sabbath school, but when he heard "loud singing in the school" he "remained out, not feeling free to enter till it was over." When making calls at houses he would not enter if he heard music within.

In the second week of Third Month, 1874, David Updegraff held a series of meetings in Dublin, assisted by Dougan Clark and others, "full equal to revival meetings of other denominations."[17] David Huddleston attended only at the established hours for the regular meetings on First and Fifth Days, and at other times felt "best satisfied at home." This silent protest from a prominent member of the Meeting was so keenly felt that Luke Woodard came to try to persuade him to attend, but he declined, although all other members of the family went. The next evening David Updegraff, Dougan Clark, and F. Evans came to talk with him.

A friendly feeling maintained, tho' we differed on some things. We did not go to M. but I was strongly urged to go. But had a peaceful night & felt no condemnation for bearing a testimony against the way the Meetings are conducted.[18]

---

[16] Journal, 6/20/90.
[17] Journal, 3/9/74.
[18] Journal, 3/12/74.

Two nights later he recorded:

Last night a time of heavenly visitation to my soul. The light of God's countenance approvingly shined upon the course which I have taken in the General Meetings. Which is an abundant compensation for the reproaches I have received on account of my singularity.[19]

On another occasion David noted his refusal to attend revival meeting:

E[lizabeth] to M. again. It today for the heads of families, to endeavor to reconcile differences, but I did not feel like being judged by A. Kenworthy, & no differences amongst us except discordant views on faith & practice.[20]

Amos Kenworthy entered the picture again a little later:

He gave out a M. tomorrow on holiness, & another at night as held heretofore. After M. he came to me, told me he wanted me to come tomorrow. I told him I could not promise. He said I had been absent mostly & was throwing my influence on the side of the devil. I told him he was too positive; he said he had a right to be positive, for it was a message from the Lord to me. So the matter dropped with the understanding that I should judge for myself.[21]

The result was that David stayed at home building a fence. Two days later Amos Kenworthy "gave out no more meetings, but went on, they say, to Hopewell. Quite a release for Dublin."[22]

David was never diffident about making his opinions known. Once when he was speaking in meeting he noticed that William Stanley took out paper and pencil and appeared to be taking notes. "I requested him to put up his paper & pencil, which he did. I continued to my own relief & peace."[23]

On another occasion Edward Bellis from Richmond arose in Dublin Meeting and "read some & talked a good deal, with a gold ring on his finger, to which I gave a silent rebuke, without a word being said. I only took hold of it, to show that I noticed it."[24]

David's reproving comments in Meeting were not always received in silence. He was part of a perennial argument as to

---

[19] Journal, 3/14/74.
[20] Journal, 10/4/80.
[21] Journal, 10/28/80.
[22] Journal, 10/30/80.
[23] Journal, 5/1/81.
[24] Journal, 4/18/86.

whether the greater authority rested in the Scriptures or in the Inward Light. One First Day Meeting he quoted Job XXXII, 8: "But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." He went on to say that the inspiration of the Almighty was before the Scriptures were written. Nathan Gause opposed this view, saying that the book of Moses was written before Job, and the Meeting closed with David feeling very tried. Following next Fifth Day meeting he was "called to task by the men elders of our M., except Josiah Morris, for putting the Spirit ahead of the Scriptures in a discourse of last first day week, as they thought it too much in opposition to what had been previously advanced in the same M."[25]

David was particularly tried whenever Oliver White spoke in Meeting:

O. White . . . was up 3 or 4 times trying to stir up the noisy life that he values . . .said he had promised *Mister* Leonard to speak at their M.[26]

Once David spoke in Meeting on

the sufficiency of the Spirit & power of God in our ministerial labors. O. White called me to task after M., thinking my remarks were designed personally for him. I told him I spoke on the subjects that presented, not thinking of him at all in time of it. But told him that I delivered it for the benefit of such as it belonged to.[27]

Three months later he recorded:

O. White also spoke & misquoted Scripture a while . . . So M. closed with nothing but praying, singing, & talking to fill the lack of Gospel ministry. A poor substitute.[28]

And once more:

Then O. White rose up & gave us what he aimed to pass off for prayer.[29]

After Uncle David and Aunt Elizabeth attended a meeting of the Elders' Committee, he wrote:

---

[25] Journal, 4/28/81.
[26] Journal, 1/4/83.
[27] Journal, 3/18/83.
[28] Journal, 6/22/83.
[29] Journal, 12/28/84.

A strong bias discoverable in the Com. in favor of putting in elders who will run with modern Quakerism, but it was in part overruled.

And following a comment on an intervening windstorm which flattened the corn, he added:

But the windy views & airy notions which are a sweeping with rapidity through our Society, bending & taking down so many of our members who have hitherto stood the storms of time, are more to be lamented than the jaring of the outward elements. In being with the Committee yesterday and today on the subject of appointment of Elders & looking over the qualifications needful to the right filling of that station, it was painful, both to me & my wife, to see so few amongst the committee that seemed disposed to heed the injunction of the Prophet when he says, "Stand ye in the ways & see, & ask for the old paths, where is the good way, & walk therein." Many appear content to know only the outside, while *professing* to know the *inner life*.[30]

Numerous departures of the Society from the old paths irked David. He considered missionary labors to be outside the realm of the Meeting, and when it was proposed to raise money "for helping J. Jones family to N. C. on a missionary trip," he and several others opposed it, "not believing in it."[31] On one occasion he attended a meeting of the Women's Foreign Missionary Association which opened by singing, reading, and prayer, "the Clerk being a young woman with her headdress trimed with feathers & flowers. Several essays read by young women on Mexico, interspersed with songs at 4 different times by a choir of 6 that rose to their feet each time with books open. Surely the enemy has come in like a flood upon us. . . . But the innovations . . . are hailed with songs of joy by many, while others weep when they remember Zion."[32]

But most trying of all was the time when Elizabeth and her friends, without his knowledge or consent, arranged for the Women's Home Mission to meet at his home. David did not find it out until the announcement in Meeting on that Fifth Day morning, and if his reaction was a little childish it should be

[30] Journal, 7/25/74.
[31] Journal, 8/25/79.
[32] Journal, 8/28/86.

remembered that he had every right to be so, as he was 87 years old:

It brought a deep baptism of trial upon me, as I did not know the nature of the meeting or whether I could feel fellowship with it or not. So I remained mostly in a separate room. But went over to Silas's[33] for a change. And there the house so full of music that I could not enjoy it. And began to feel that I "had not where to lay my head," in my own house.[34]

That year saw the introduction of an organ in the Meeting-house. The journal tells the story:

Perhaps I never felt more tried & low in relation to our poor disturbed Society than last evening & night. Sleep through the night very much departed from me. The word came that an organ for music was taken into our meeting house for the amusement of the children who were to convene there this evening. I also remembered that today was the day for Wm. Watts to come round on his circuit as a regularly appointed preacher employed by some of our friends to preach twice a month for our M'g. I was closely tried about going to such a Meeting where a hired minister officiated as leader & where an organ was before us. But when the time [came] to go I felt more resigned & contented to go. So went tho' under feelings of sadness. Found the organ was in the E. room & out of sight, as that room they say is fitted up for to-night & the entertainment of the children. So the curtains were kept down & that room locked. But we have active & leading ones amongst us who would be willing to introduce the organ more openly to view in our S. Schools & Meetings as soon as they think it will bear. So we are getting along. Some rejoicing over the great changes which have come upon us & others are mourning over the desolations of our Zion, that was once a quiet habitation.[35]

David still held to the Friends custom of wearing his hat in Meeting, except during prayer. Perhaps that may have been one reason he disliked so much vocal prayer. Thus it was with surprise and thankfulness that at one Meeting, although there was Bible reading and "one spell of singing," there was no prayer for the first time in twenty years:

So I got the privilege to sit with my hat on all the time, for about the first time perhaps since we came to Dublin. But it was a soft one &

[33] Silas was his son, who lived across the road from him, where he was likewise in the nursery business and operated a sorghum mill.

[34] Journal, 7-13-87.

[35] Journal, 6/26/87.

not uncomfortable. So I saw no reason for taking it off, unless it was to conform to the ways of others, which I did not feel easy to do.[36]

As previously indicated, he was opposed to prayer meetings, and when he was asked to have one at his house, according to the prevailing custom, he did not consent, "as I believe such human arrangements are killing the Divine life amongst us."[37]

With what seemed to his neighbors a puzzling inconsistency in one who objected to music, David loved to repeat poetry as well as to read and write it, although he confined himself to poetry of a religious nature, which he read "not for the poetry, but I often find constructive sentiments corresponding to my views."[38] Once when he and Richard Hubbard were making a series of calls while attending Walnut Ridge Monthly Meeting, they stopped at Joseph Binford's. David repeated some poetry to the children, thinking it likely to appeal to young minds, "whereupon Richard took the liberty to sing, which raised a disagreeable, & to me an undesirable, discussion on the subject."[39] Once in a plea for spiritual worship he quoted a poem in Meeting, and one of the members came to him afterwards:

I. Pretlo[w] gave me an Eldering for repeating poetry from an uninspired writer instead of reading the scriptures . . . . I find that I have got the frowns & sensure of several by speaking against reading & music as I did in Meeting.[40]

On the proper conduct of funerals David had decided views, noting every departure from what he considered seemly practice. When Sol Meredith, the Civil War hero, was buried with great pomp and military parade, with excursion trains bringing an assembly of ten or twelve thousand people, David deplored the splendor and vain show.[41] When Sarah Smith's funeral was preached in Dublin Friends Meetinghouse the coffin was said to cost $80 and was

highly ornamented with flowers and marks of vanity. The whole was conducted more like the extravagant customs of the vain world

[36] Journal, 5/16/88.
[37] Journal, 2/6/90.
[38] Journal, 7/9/86.
[39] Journal, 6/23/74.
[40] Journal, 6/3/88.
[41] Journal, 10/25/75.

[than] like the humble & moderate example of primitive Quakerism, which it appears to me has nearly vanished away within the limits of our Y.M. Great eulogies were placed by the speakers upon the deceased, as if they *knew* beyond doubt that she was among the redeemed ones in heaven. Samuel Morris sat by me. We after M. talked about the subject. He said such practices were not tolerated among them (the Hixites). It is a great cause of sadness to me. We are still professing to be Friends, but are far from the primitive practice & purity of ancient Friends. Lamentable![42]

The funeral ceremony for his granddaughter Caroline (daughter of Silas) was particularly painful to him. He described it in detail, with a touch of wry humor which doubtless was not intended:

The funeral at the usual hour of our M. We understood that Wm. Watts & Ann Gause had been sent for to "preach" the funeral sermon. So as Meeting was setting the song books were handed round, & singing soon began. And after they had 3 rounds at it Ann Gause informed that the funeral services were to be conducted by Wm. Watts, & the train that he was to come on was behind. So she proposed that the time should be used in singing. So 2 other spells followed, & Joseph Cox proposed that while we were waiting on Watts it would be a good time for such as felt like it to testify in favor of Caroline's life, & Nathan Gause arose & spoke, & then another song, & Watts came in. No one seemed to once think of waiting on the Lord. But were waiting on Watts who was on the train that they said was 20 minutes late. He took his seat by Ann & they whispered together a while & she prayed. Then he read from Job & 2 or 3 other places & singing again, when he arose & spoke near an hour. Then Ann spoke. And while the company was taking the last look, singing went on again, making 8 spells. More than I ever heard in one meeting before. We did not go to the interment. Home feeling sorrowful.[43]

On another funeral occasion David scandalized the congregation by an outburst of righteous indignation. Marshall Schooley's corpse was brought back to the home of his parents, who had no church membership, so that at first it was thought the funeral would be dispensed with. A last-minute decision, however, resulted in the funeral being held at the Friends Meetinghouse. David had understood that the funeral was to coincide with the regular Friends Meeting, as was the Quaker custom

[42] Journal, 12/19/85.

[43] Journal, 6/2/87.

of that day. But when he arrived for Meeting he found that the funeral assembly, with the ministers and choir selected for the occasion, had come a half hour early and had taken the head seats, leaving the members of the Meeting to find such places as they could. The service proceeded after the pattern of other churches, and when the time came for the Dublin Friends to begin their service the funeral showed no sign of ending. Telling the story in his journal, David wrote:

> By that time I became exceedingly tried, seeing our meeting which we had been educated to look upon with a feeling of sacredness was entirely disregarded, & another meeting taking the place of it. So when he [the minister] arose, I arose also, & informed that there appeared to be a misunderstanding. That it was our M. & that the hour had now come. And inquired what the understanding was, whether we were to give up our Meeting without our consent, or whether we were to hold it all together, or after their's was over. The minister made some reply that I did not distinctly hear. But a few of our members gave encouragement for the funeral M. to go on. So it did in the Methodist stile, the man preaching about the usual length. Then a little pause. And last look taken by the congregation orderly walking round, one at a time. And singing going the same time. Then the [meeting] was closed in silence, until it was feelingly broken by Dr. Boyd who spoke at some length & ability. 2 or 3 others in brief also—and the company dispersed without any effort for Friends to hold our Meeting. But it was not long before some of our folks began on [me] pretty rough, for the very improper conduct from me, as if it was almost impardonable & would tend to the breaking up of our Meeting, & that I would have to ask forgiveness or it would not be passed over. So I returned home, feeling no condemnation, & found the matter no better there.[44]

David often "found the matter no better there" in his home and among his relations, so he turned for support to acquaintances among the Philadelphia Friends, who viewed with an equal eye the defections of Midwestern Quakers. Joseph Elkinton and Edward Maris kept him supplied with tracts, which he distributed diligently in such ways as he could find. In strawberry season he would walk into Dublin with a basket holding several quarts of strawberries and a handful of tracts, and with each quart he sold he would prevail on the purchaser to take a tract free. Following his visit to Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in the spring of 1883 a box of tracts and a package of "the

[44] Journal, 11/10/86.

Philadelphia Address" came to him by freight and express. He took copies of the Address to Fifth Day Meeting, and at the close offered them to such as were willing to receive them:

I made quite a breese. Our Elders wanted to examine them first. But I objected & still proposed to distribute on my own responsibility & did so to some extent . . . . Joseph Cox came to see me on the Address subject in the evening. Was aiming to call a M. of the Elders in the morning. Wanted me to attend.[45]

But David did not attend, and about noon Joseph Thombs and Sol Elliott came to report the order of the Elders that he cease to hand out the Address and that he return the copies to Philadelphia

and inform them that they were too pernicious, unsound, & unscriptural to be admitted. They also returned the copy they had been examining with quite a number of marks, showing the passages they had objected to as unsound, from Fox, Penn, Barclay &C, showing that it was not the writings of our forefathers but our modern views of the Scriptures that we were to be governed by. And signifying that they now in their M. that they had just had were clothed with authority to demand obedience from me. But I thought they had no authority from Discipline or usage to sit in judgment over Philad Y.M. nor me. So gave them to understand that I expected to go on with the distribution of the Address to such as were willing to receive it. But I plainly saw, by their expressions & looks, that they had it in their hearts to enter a complaint against me for insubordination if I continued to disregard their decision. In the afternoon I copied off in another Address the markings which they had made & sent the one that they had used back to Philad, for them to see the doctrinal views that our Indiana friends objected to. I am abundantly confirmed in the belief that now from their discussion, & from their marking as objectionable, so many passages in the Address, from our valuable early Friends, on vital & fundamental doctrines, that we are no longer one people. We do not speak the same language, nor walk by the same rule, nor mind the same thing. But Satan has entered into our once highly favored Society, & is carrying away a large portion of it, under a popular delusion, by his transformed appearance as an angel of light . . . . I also wrote a pretty full letter as to how the Address subject was progressing here & sent both to Dr. E. Maris, requesting him to show them to Joseph Walton & others. Then, after taking them to the office, went to bed & rested well, feeling pretty comfortable under the belief that I had done the best I know.[46]

---

[45] Journal, 6/7/83.

[46] Journal, 6/8/83.

David fully expected that he would be disowned by the Meeting over this incident. But ten days passed in silence. Then Joseph Cox came and engaged thirty-two quarts of strawberries from his patch without referring to the Address, though David meanwhile had been handing it out at every opportunity.

> Feel thankfully free from anxiety as to the result, although I well know it is contrary to the advice of our Select M. here. But I fully believe their decission was not founded on Discipline nor righteousness, so I patiently disregard it.[47]

Week followed week, and the situation did not change. David was wise enough not to offer tracts to those he knew would object. When Joseph Cox came to see him on a First Day afternoon in Eighth Month, David was sure he was to receive an eldering, but the time passed "in social friendly chat," and David was led to hope "our Select body is looking towards a reconciliation on the Address subject, without any more words, as they appear to treat me with respectable friendship of late, for which I thank God more than man."[48]

A year later, Joseph Walton and Edward Sharpless stopped to visit David Huddleston and Dublin Meeting on their way westward. They were given seats of honor, but as the Meeting progressed David feared "the way was about closed up against our eastern friends." However, Edward Sharpless found an opening, and "arose in Gospel power & clearness. Then Joseph Walton had a few words on spiritual worship, all together having a favorable impression on the M. & opening a more friendly feeling towards Philadelphia Friends, which was quite manifest in the greetings at the rise of the M."[49]

Thus the episode ended in victory for David and the Philadelphia Friends. He carried on from year to year his distribution of tracts, though warily and judiciously, for he well knew that if he pushed the issue too far, he would lose all he had gained. He would slyly leave a parcel of tracts on the end of the upper seat in the Meetinghouse, and would find the pile gradually growing smaller, though he feared they did not get

---

[47] Journal, 6/18/83.
[48] Journal, 8/5/83.
[49] Journal, 10/18/84.

into the hands of those who needed them most. "Our folks seem to have a prejudice against anything from Philadelphia," he wrote in his journal.[50]

David's labors for the true faith extended beyond the distribution of tracts, as indicated in the following entry:

> Sent to George J. Scattergood the names of such as are willing to receive & read "The Friend" six months gratis. As the conductors of that paper want it introduced more in the limits of our Yearly M., & so do I, as I believe there is quite an unaccountable prejudice against it.[51]

As his days neared their end David had to give up his work with his trees and strawberries. He spent his time "piling wood and doing notions," faithfully reading the Friends periodicals, George Fox's *Journal* and Barclay's *Apology*, while Elizabeth was engaged in "carpet tackings" (sewing rags for carpets) or "a nitting." In recognition of his contributions to *The Friend* and as an evidence of their esteem, David frequently received gifts ranging from five to a hundred dollars from John S. Comfort, Joseph Walton, and other Eastern Friends to provide the comforts needed in his old age. He accepted these gifts gratefully and in the spirit in which they were made.

In one of the last entries in his journal, after he had spent two months in bed, David dictated to his daughter Eliza, "I mostly rest well and feel peaceful."[52] On that contented note his long life drew to its close.

"If thou hadst known him personally," wrote a correspondent in *The Friend*,[53] "I think thou wouldst have admired the tenderness and gentleness of the man, combined with firmness in support of our principles."

---

[50] Journal, 1/25/88.
[51] Journal, 1/5/89.
[52] Journal, 9/23/90.
[53] J. Bell of San Jose, Calif., in *The Friend*, 64 (1891), 181.

JOHN BRIGHT AND THE FACTORY ACTS: HUMANITARIANISM vs. *LAISSEZ FAIRE*

By Edwin B. Bronner*

JOHN BRIGHT was one of the great towers of strength in nineteenth-century England. He stood like a great oak, buffeted by many a storm—storms stemming from selfish interests, from landowners, from the Church, from the whole nation at times—and yet he remained steadfast, following his beliefs and his convictions in supporting a program of humanitarianism, liberalism, freedom and justice. For forty years he maintained a place in the House of Commons and in the hearts and minds of Englishmen which many of his contemporaries gladly would have filled. After his "Angel of Death" speech during the Crimean War, Disraeli came to him and said, "Bright, I would give all that I ever had to have made that speech you made just now."[1]

Perhaps a brief quotation from William E. Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on the death of Bright will express what the writer is attempting to portray for the reader:

> We feel that Mr. Bright is entitled to a higher eulogy than any that could be due to intellect or any that could be due to success. Of mere success he was indeed a conspicuous example; in intellect he may lay claim to a most distinguished place; but the character of the man lay deeper than his intellect, deeper than his eloquence, deeper than anything that can be described or seen on the surface, and the supreme eulogy which is his due I apprehend to be this, that he elevated political life to a higher elevation, and to a loftier standard, and that he has thereby bequeathed to his country the character of a statesman which can be made the subject not only of admiration, and not only of gratitude, but of reverential contemplation.[2]

The Bright family was of yeoman stock, and had long lived in Wiltshire, but began to move north in the eighteenth century, and eventually, in 1802, came to Rochdale, in Lancashire, where

---

* Edwin B. Bronner is a member of the Department of History at Temple University.

[1] George M. Trevelyan, *The Life of John Bright* (Boston, 1913), p. 245.

[2] Address delivered March 29, 1889.

the family was to remain. The family had been members of the Society of Friends for many generations on both sides. John Bright's father, Jacob Bright, was apprenticed to a Friend, William Holme, and from him learned the weaving trade which was to provide the income for the family. He began business on his own, with two partners who furnished the capital, in 1809, and very shortly married the mother of John, Martha Wood.

One of eleven children, John Bright was sent to a succession of schools, including the now well-known Ackworth. He complained bitterly about the food there, said that dinners at least half of the week were intolerable, and added, "In the matter of punishments it was harsh if not barbarous. . . ."[3] In fact, as the result of his complaints to his father, an investigation took place and reforms were instituted. At the age of fifteen, his school days were ended, and he went home to take part in the prosperous family business.

The Brights lived very near the mill, knew all who worked in the mill, and had a personal interest in their employees. The spirit of the Quakers was present in their business affairs, and the relationship was always one which could stand inspection, especially in comparison with the usual treatment of the working classes at that time. In later years when Bright's detractors in Parliament said that he was universally hated by his operatives, the men held a spontaneous mass meeting to deny the accusation.[4] The above has much importance in view of the main topic of this paper.

John Bright spent these years in reading a great deal before and after work. He studied the Bible and read much by John Milton. These two sources often revealed themselves in later years. He studied the beliefs of Friends; and the concept of freedom of conscience, the idea of "that of God in every man," and the teaching that all men are equal, had great influence upon his life. His father subscribed to the *Manchester Guardian,* and the family was interested in Liberal politics, especially after Joseph Pease, a Quaker, was admitted to the House of

[3] R. A. J. Walling, ed., *The Diaries of John Bright* (New York, 1931), pp. 5-7.

[4] John T. Mills, *John Bright and the Quakers* (London, 1935), II, 192.

Commons in the Reform Parliament. Bright did some traveling, to Ireland, and to the continent, going as far east as Palestine. Perhaps the most important influences on him in these early days were the teaching of Richard Cobden, the Anti-Corn-Law League, and the attack upon the Protectionist System. Bright personally combined these Free Trade concepts with the Benthamite ideas, and these together with his Quaker background produced a political philosophy of freedom and individualism, and of humanitarian regard for one's fellow men. Yet he kept a loyalty to England and the Constitution which made him say in later life that he was a conservative.[5]

John Bright went into politics upon the death of his first wife, Elizabeth Priestman, after the conversation with Cobden which is so familiar to those interested in this period in history. Cobden said, "There are thousands of houses in England at this moment where wives, mothers and children are dying of hunger." He invited Bright to join with him in a crusade against the Corn Laws. Bright accepted, and his entire future was in politics.[6]

It is impossible in a paper of this size even to list all of the crusades and causes which captured Bright's support and enthusiasm. After his initial success, with Cobden, in seeing the Corn Laws repealed, he was extremely active in supporting universal manhood suffrage, and especially the Reform Bill of 1867. He favored toleration for religious minorities in many ways: more freedom for Jews, further participation in government for Catholics in Ireland, repeal of the law providing for payment of tithes by dissenters, support of opening Oxford and Cambridge to dissenters, and other such projects. He had great sympathy for the rural laborer, and worked long for the repeal of the Game Laws. In opposing the Crimean War and supporting the North in the American Civil War he was not daunted by the unpopularity of his position. His entire lifetime was spent in seeking various humanitarian reforms.

Notwithstanding all this, and with what some would call perverseness, this paper concerns the attitude of John Bright on one matter in which his beliefs and his vote ran counter to

[5] *Ibid.*, II, 189-92.
[6] Walling, *op. cit.*, pp. 54, 55.

our present-day concept of humanitarianism and liberalism. In the 1840's, he opposed the Factory Acts, which would have limited the labor of women in the cotton mills to ten hours.

Perhaps in light of the almost universal goodness of his life, it is grossly unfair to seize upon such a picayune matter as Bright's opposition to the factory legislation. We might just agree with Emerson that "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds," and not look for some reason for Bright's apparent deflection from an otherwise consistent life. However. the fact that it is an exception increases interest in this attitude. Many writers have been curious about the position taken by Bright, and he has been subject to much abuse for his viewpoint.

There were several so-called Factory Acts, beginning first with laws to regulate child labor, and progressing from that into the matter of hours of labor for women. In 1802 Sir Robert Peel, father of the prime minister, carried a twelve-hour bill for children, and other regulations followed. In 1833 the leadership of the movement for government regulation passed from J. R. Stephens, John Fielden, Richard Oastler and others, to Lord Ashley, later Lord Shaftesbury, and most of the opposition which Bright held for the Factory Acts included antagonism for Ashley.[7] Anthony Ashley Cooper, seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, was a nobleman with a sincere humanitarian motivation, who spent his lifetime in the service of the working class. He was deeply religious, he had been severely shocked during childhood and adolescence by the evils of the new industrial system, and he dedicated his life to reform. It is extremely odd that the Factory Act controversy should find two men with similar motivations strongly opposing one another, and it is even more difficult to understand why they, ever after, mistrusted and disliked one another.

John Bright spoke very warmly on the matter of factory legislation. His fundamental view was this: "I do not differ on this point [the ten-hour day]. But I differ on the point whether a reduction of time ought to be carried out by the Legis-

[7] J. L. Hammond and Barbara Hammond, *Lord Shaftesbury* (London, 1925), pp. 10-21.

lature or by a regulation between the masters and operatives themselves."[8] Samuel Kydd wrote: "Mr. Bright was, on principle, opposed to all interference and prognosticated that the bill, if passed, 'would cause, in the first place, an extraordinary delusion, and in the second place, a fatal disappointment.' "[9] C. A. Vince cited Bright's statement, "Most of our evils arise from legislative interference"; and added that he was a faithful adherent to the old radical doctrine of *laissez faire*.[10] (In his youth Bright had supported factory legislation, but his later adherence to the Manchester School changed his ideas on the subject.)

His second argument generally went something like this: "Bright was justly convinced that, bad as the conditions of life were in the cotton factories, they were far worse in other industries, and worst of all perhaps in agriculture, whence Lord Ashley drew his income. Yet no one ever proposed to limit the hours of agricultural labour."[11] Margaret Hirst has reminded her readers that whereas agrarian workers received six or seven shillings, men in the factories received more than twice as much.[12] Bright quoted the Factory Report of the Commissioners to support his defense of the humanity in the cotton mills, and stated that conditions in London and the south of England were much worse. The book *A History of Factory Legislation* also emphasizes this as one of Bright's best arguments.[13]

Other expressions were made by Bright to prove his point. He spoke of the peril of interfering with the manufacturer's profits.[14] He said that by treating the master as the natural enemy of the operatives, the government would embitter industrial re-

---

[8] Mills, *op cit.*, II, 173. I am only interested in the attitudes expressed and have made no attempt to differentiate between Bright's statements on the various bills from 1844 to 1850.

[9] *The History of the Factory Movement (1802-1847)* (London, 1857), II, 241.

[10] *John Bright* (New York, 1898), p. 34.

[11] Trevelyan, *op cit.*, p. 155.

[12] *John Bright* (London, 1945), p. 13.

[13] Mills, *op. cit.*, II, 176; Elizabeth L. Hutchins and Amy Harrison, *A History of Factory Legislation* (London, 1926) p. 90.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 95.

lations and spoil much that had been done.[15] He often spoke of his own life in the factory and the treatment of employees in the Bright mills to defend his opposition to the legislation.[16] One of his most telling arguments, and one which he firmly believed, was that those who were pushing factory legislation did so merely to embarrass the factory owner. He was convinced that it was landowners and opponents of the Anti-Corn-Law League, who pushed the Ten Hour Bill, to get even with the manufacturers for defeating the Corn Laws.[17] He opposed the Factory Laws because they prevented men and women from working long enough hours to earn a living wage. He advocated freedom to work without restraint as an economic principle.[18]

No one has ever even faintly suggested that Bright did not at all times support legislation in favor of children. Trevelyan writes: "He still admitted the justice and necessity of laws to protect children, whom he regarded as unable to fend for themselves against unkind parents or employers. Any statement that Bright ever opposed laws to protect children is untrue."[19]

Supporters of the factory legislation and of Lord Shaftesbury present Bright in another light in connection with these debates. There is one point in particular on which writers cannot agree. This is the matter of the so-called Dodds letters. In the midst of an attack on the Ten Hour Bill Bright made some reference to certain testimony which Shaftesbury presented, which came from a man named Dodds. Dodds was a blackguard who had been trying to sell information to the supporters of the Factory Laws, about the evils of the cotton mills. The story of what occurred on the floor of the Commons varies from writer to writer. G. B. Smith states that Bright accused Shaftesbury of issuing pamphlets written by Dodds which were untrue, and said that he had letters which accused the lord of using Dodds and

---

[15] John Harold Clapham, *An Economic History of Modern Britain* (Cambridge, England, 1926-38), II, 412.

[16] George B. Smith, *The Life and Speeches of John Bright* (New York, 1881), I, 167; Mills, *op. cit.*, II, 188.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

[18] Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 62.

[19] *Op cit.*, p. 154.

then casting him aside. Bright then said that Dodds as a source of information was completely untrustworthy, and that the lord would be viewed with suspicion by all if he employed such methods. Ashley was furious and accused Bright of making charges and insinuations which he could not prove. Bright answered, "I told the noble lord that the instruments he carried on his operations with were not worthy of his cause or of him. . . . I tell him that I think he is much misled by these men." He added other words, merely reiterating those two points, according to Smith.[20] Edwin Hodder, on the other hand, quotes Bright as saying, "I regret if in stating these things I have said a word that could be considered derogatory to the character of the noble lord. I know I have a warm temper, but I meant no personal insult. I desired merely to state facts, and I readily withdraw any offensive expression."[21] Mills is convinced that Bright did not apologize, but merely proved that he did not say what Shaftesbury thought he had said, and he claimed that Cobden verified that interpretation.[22]

John W. Bready portrays the divulgence of the Dodds letters as a dramatic act by Bright in which he made insinuation after insinuation, but feigned reluctance to read from the letters until cries of "Read, Read" resounded through the Commons. He wrote further, "Indeed, whenever he [Bright] came into grips with this subject, the worst ingredients of his nature immediately leaped to the surface, and the dogmas of the Manchester School domineered over his nobler impulses."[23] The Hammonds declare that Ashley and his friends had been deceived by Dodds, and that Bright should not be blamed for exposing this fact. However, they added that Bright was "needlessly offensive," and that the House compelled him to apologize.[24] The true situation is somewhat concealed, but one suspects that Bright was too enthusiastic

---

[20] *Op. cit.*, I, 62, 63.

[21] Edwin Hodder, *The Earl of Shaftesbury* (London, 1886-87), II, 28.

[22] *Op. cit.*, II, 178.

[23] J. W. Bready, *Lord Shaftesbury and Social-Industrial Progress* (London, 1933), pp. 199-200.

[24] *Op. cit.*, pp. 94-95.

in his defense, that Ashley was taken aback by being discovered in his error, and that Bright disclaimed any intention of harming Ashley, which was taken as an apology by the supporters of the lord.

Another controversy in opinions is less complicated. Shaftesbury had been visiting in Lancashire, and Bright's brother invited him to come to inspect the Bright mills. Ashley did not do so, and said that he refrained in order to escape any accusation of spying on his opponent behind his back. Bright, on the other hand, accused Ashley of unfairness and a refusal to see well-run factories, and took it as further evidence of the bias of landowners. After Bright had lashed out at Ashley concerning this matter, he left the floor of the Commons when Ashley stood to defend himself—a petty action.[25]

Most detractors of Bright quote a report in *A History of Factory Legislation* as follows: John Bright addressed the House in a style " . . . perhaps the most vindictive towards the working classes ever used in the British Parliament."[26] Naturally, biographers of Bright have attempted to prove just the opposite, and no actual vindictive statement is ever quoted. Hodder writes of Bright: " . . . then taking up the old libel as to the conditions of the Dorsetshire labourers. . . . " However, the Hammonds strike a more substantial blow for Ashley by pointing out that his father had driven him from home for supporting the Factory Acts, and that he was in ill favor in his shire for his humanitarian reforms.[27] Ashley wrote in his diary, "Bright was ever my most malignant opponent," and that feeling persisted all of his lifetime.[28] In his diary, Bright left behind his opinion of Ashley. He had received an invitation from the noble to dine with him to meet Harriet Beecher Stowe, but had declined because of a previous engagement. He added, "In truth I don't wish to fraternize with him, for I think him in many things a mischievous character . . . ."[29] Even so, Hodder admits that both Sir James

[25] Mills, *op. cit.*, II, 174; Hodder, *op. cit.*, II, 130, 131.
[26] Hutchins and Harrison, p. 75.
[27] Hodder, *op. cit.*, II, 27; Hammond and Hammond, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
[28] Hodder, *op. cit.*, II, 210.
[29] Walling, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

Graham and Sir Robert Peel had been much stronger in their opposition to the Factory Acts than Bright. Trevelyan writes that Bright did not feel as strongly on this matter as on others if the number of speeches he made on the subject is any indication of interest. He observes that Bright only delivered a half-dozen speeches on the topic, while he spoke four times as often in opposing the Game Laws, and delivered fifty times as many speeches in support of the franchise, and one hundred times as many addresses in opposing the Corn Laws. Trevelyan makes no defense of Bright and his views, but he does present the facts of the case and leaves any conclusions for the reader.[30]

Several biographies and articles omit any reference to the Factory Act controversy, while recounting rather carefully many other actions taken by Bright. The *Times* obituary, more than thirty pages in book form, makes no mention of it, nor do the full-length biographies by James T. Mills, or Lewis Apjohn. The book, *Pioneers of Reform*, by D. C. Johnson, makes no mention of the Factory Acts in the "Bright" chapter, but briefly notices his opposition in the "Shaftesbury" section.[31] Perhaps it is mere coincidence, but one may well suspect that there was a tendency to ignore this attitude because it didn't fit nicely into the over-all pattern. Paul H. Emden in *Quakers in Commerce* indicates that Bright's viewpoint stemmed from the individualism of Friends, and certainly Quakers did believe in individual freedom.[32] John Travis Mills suggests the same reason, and calls Bright "the high priest of Individualism.[33] Bright believed in *laissez faire* because of a mixed spiritual and political philosophy.

The following quotation from a speech in Birmingham, November 10, 1868, perhaps gives insight into Bright's real

---

[30] *Op. cit.*, pp. 154, 158.

[31] *Biographies of Eminent Persons* (London, 1893); James T. Mills, *John Bright* (London, 1893); Lewis Apjohn, *John Bright*, etc., (n.d.); D. C. Johnson, *Pioneers of Reform* (London, 1929).

[32] (London, 1939), pp. 86, 87.

[33] *Op. cit.*, II, 187. It is interesting to note that today British Friends are predominantly Labor Party adherents, and have gone to the left of nineteenth-century liberalism.

feelings on the matter: "Well, if it were true that the Factory Act was all good, and that the opponents of it were all wrong, it still would not be wondered at that I, who was myself concerned in the trade which was to be mainly affected, I who represented the great city of Manchester, it would not be wondered at much if I took in some degree a one-sided view of that question."[34] This speech was delivered in a campaign for re-election. It was in answer to attacks by the Conservatives on his position more than twenty years earlier. Can we allow this statement to mean that he had reformed, and that he had become convinced that factory legislation was desirable?

There are two other statements left behind, which are dated after 1868. In 1873 at London Yearly Meeting, a petition was being drawn up against intemperance, and there was an amendment suggested, to the effect that females engaged in public houses should be given the benefits of the Factory Laws. Bright opposed the addition, and said, "The Meeting had expressed no opinion on the question of restricting adult female labour. . . As it stood he could not set his name to such a petition."[35] This would indicate that his old feeling still persisted. Notice the phrase, "the question of restricting adult female labour." He had opposed the Factory Laws because they deprived a person of the opportunity to work as long as he wished.

The other statement is also quite definite.

One Ash, Rochdale, Jan. 1, 1884.

Dear Sir,—I was opposed to all legislation restricting the adults, men or women. I was in favour of legislation restricting the labour and guarding the health of children. I could not therefore support [such] Bills . . . . I still hold the opinion that to limit by law the time during which adults may work is unwise and in many cases oppressive.

JOHN BRIGHT[36]

Apparently he never really changed his mind on the matter. If his statement in Birmingham indicates anything more than campaign oratory, it is overshadowed by these other two state-

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[36] H. J. Leech, editor, *The Public Letters of the Right Hon. John Bright, M. P.* (London, 1885), p. 292.

ments. Perhaps S. Maccoby was correct in classifying Bright and Cobden as middle-class radicals.[37] Others have put it more bluntly, and indicate that Bright was a radical on many things until his own economic position was threatened. That is perhaps putting it too strongly. He was not afraid of his economic nor his political position when he opposed the Crimean War. His support of the American Civil War, despite the shortage of cotton which resulted from it, was not motivated by economic thinking.

He was sincere in his opposition. He felt sure that the legislation was antagonistic to the new political philosophy. He believed it would harm the workingman. He was convinced that the supporters of the Acts were spurred on by jealousy and hatred. His own thinking about the conditions of the workingman in cotton mills was influenced by his own relation to the operatives and by his awareness of the despicable conditions in other parts of the economy, notably agriculture. He was wrong, to be sure, and yet he was sincere in his beliefs.

Trevelyan has noted a bright spot in the whole picture: "This process of mutual exposure, vigorously conducted by the two sections of the wealthier classes, was the beginning of salvation for the oppressed millions."[38] The Hammonds have expressed the same idea in these words: "It was fortunate for England that landlords pitied the pale factory faces of the Lancashire mills, and that manufacturers pitied the cottagers of Dorset, starving in their creeper-hidden hovels."[39]

Finally, it should be remembered that the same John Bright who opposed factory legislation was in large part responsible for giving to the workingman enough to eat and the right to vote.

---

[37] *English Radicalism (1832-52)* (London, 1935), p. 341.
[38] *Op. cit.*, pp. 94, 95.
[39] *Op. cit.*, p. 120.

Notes and Documents

WILLIAM PENN TO THOMAS LLOYD

A Letter Conveying News of the Death of Charles II, the Accession of James II, and Sundry Matters Relating to Pennsylvania

TRANSCRIBED BY CARROLL FREY

[This letter from William Penn to Thomas Lloyd, President of the Council and, in the absence of the Proprietor, the ranking official in Pennsylvania, is now in the Penn Mutual Collection in Philadelphia, having formerly been in the libraries of George Clifford Thomas and John Gribbel. So far as the Editor knows, it has never before been published in full, although excerpts (containing some inaccuracies) were printed by Robert Proud in his *History of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1797), I, 290-91, and by Samuel M. Janney in his *Life of William Penn* (Philadelphia, 1852), 253-54. It is now printed *verbatim et literatim* as transcribed by Carroll Frey, Editor, The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, with the assistance of Grace M. Kean.

[The letter is of interest for a number of reasons—not least for the graphic account of the death of Charles II with which (after suitable greetings to Lloyd) it opens. Penn's cautious hopes for an end to the persecution of Quakers now that his friend, the Roman Catholic James II, was on the throne were presently to be fulfilled by the Declaration of Indulgence of 1687, but his hope of returning "shortly" to his province "with ten great ships" was to be long deferred. The Proprietor's personal interest in his colonists is manifested by the number of settlers whom he mentions by name, asking Lloyd to remember him to them. No effort has been made to identify all these persons; this we leave to our readers, who will find among them many figures prominent in the early history of the Quaker Colony.—EDITOR]

London, 16th 3 mo. 84/5

Dear friend T. Lloyd

My true & sincere love reaches to thee & Thyn, desireing your encrease in all earthly & heavenly blessings that y^e^ God of our breath & manyfold mercys may be honored, to whom belongs all glory forever.

I have no doubt upon me of thy faithfull & prudent Care in my publick affairs, & have remembered thee with ease & some

pleasure in my Spirit on y^{t} account. And truly Thomas the frame of the world requires it.

The King is dead & y^{e} Duke succeeds peacably, he was well on y^{e} first day night, being y^{e} 1st of feb^{r}, but about 8 next morning as he satt down to shave, his head twicht both ways or sides, & gave a Skreech, & fell as dead & so remain'd some hours, they opertunely blooded & cupt him, & plyed his head wth red hott frying pans, he returned & continued till 6th day noon, but mostly in great tortures. he seemed very penitent, asking pardon of all & y^{e} poorest subject he had wronged, prayed for pardon & to be delivered out of y^{e} world, y^{e} Duke appearing mighty humble & Sorrowfull, twas a loss wth his gain, he was an able man for a divided & troubled Kingdom. the present King was proclaimed about 3 o'clock that day. A proclamation followed wth y^{e} King's Speech; to maintain the church and State as establesht, to keep Property & use clemency. Tunage & Poundage wth y^{e} excise are received de bene esse till y^{e} Parl. meet[;] one is now chusing; y^{e} people for westminster just gon by to chuse. it sitts 19th 3 ^{mo} next. in Scotland one next mo. Severitys continue Still, but Some ease to us faintly promessed. be carefull that no indecent Speaches pass agst y^{e} Goverm^{t}, for the King goeing wth his Queen publickly to mass in Whit[e]hall gives occasion to weak people. he declared he conceald himselfe to obey his Bro: & y^{t} now he would be above bord, w^{ch} we like the better on many accounts. I was with him & told him so, but withall hoped we should come in for a share. he smiled & said he desired not y^{t} peaceable people should be disturbed for their religion, & till his Coronation ye 23, when he & his consort are together to be crowned, no hopes of release, & till y^{e} Parl. no hopes of any fixt liberty. My business I would hope is better. the late K the Papists will have dyed a R[oman] C[atholic] for he refused (after his usuall way of evading uneasy things, with unprepardness first & then weakness) ye church of englands communion. Bishop Ken, of wells prest him, y^{t} it would be to his comfort & that of his people to see he dyed of y^{t} religion he had made profession of living, but it would not do, & once all but y^{e} Duke, E of bath & Ld. feversham were turned out, & one Huddleston, a Romish Priest was seen about y^{t} time near y^{e}

chamber. this is most of our news. the Popish lords & Gentry goe to Whithall to mass dayly & the Lower (or Royall) chappell is cram'd (by vyeing) with the Protestant Lords & Gentry. the late Kings children, even by the Dutches of Portsmouth goe theither. our King stands more upon his terms then y^e^ other with france; & tho he has not his brothers abilitys, he has great discipline & industry. If he will give liberty to conscientious people all will do well. If not, I expect judgem^ts^ & trouble. here is a Spotted feaver creeping about y^e^ town. the Sutlers whole family by Whitehall & about 30 of y^e^ Guard are dead; none knows what to make of it; ye physitians are at a stand w^t^ to call it. cold, then a Stagnation, then a feaver, Spotts & death, but they differ too·

The designe of takeing away L[or]d Balt[imore's] Patent, Swallows up our dispute, for y^e^ [*sic*] has promest to confirm my graunt. there I am, but I hope y^t^ may be without y^t^ loss to him. Pray be carefull of thy carriage to one Gray, a Rom. Cath. Gent. y^t^ comes over now. he is subtile & prying & touchy, a temper not unlike Somebody there, but not such a bottom in other things. he is a Scholler, & avers to y^e^ Calvanists. lett Dr. More be cautiond of him, he comes in a post. be sure please him in his land & for distance he must take where it is clear of other pretentions.

I hope care is taken to buy of y^e^ Indians, a days Journy above Consciahockin I have given earnest for to Sickatickon, as my Store book Shoes. tell them I am comeing shortly with ten great ships with me & as they use me, we shall use them. I have sent them some caps as p lettr to T. Holmes, James Claypole (over w^ch^ family be tender for truths sake) R. Turner & S. Carpenter.

I desire thee to know Coll. Dongans result about y^t^ land after his oaths & letters y^t^ I should have it. Sasqhanagh I mean.

for R. Pret I have writt to thos above & am pleasd with all you did but no ready mony. I had rather give him 5,000 Acres then allow w^t^ is allowed of 6 miles Square. alas y^e^ world is runing over to you, & great quantitys together is to putt y^e^ Sale of land out of my own hands, after I have Spent w^t^ I gott by my own, on y^e^ publick Service, for I am 3,000 lb. wors in my estate then at first. I can say it before the lord & have only y^e^ comfort

of haveing approved my selfe a faithfull Steward to my understanding & abilitys & y^t^ I hope my children shall receive it in y^e^ love of yours when we are gone.

Pray speak to P. Robinson, about y^e^ estate of Acred. his friends are dissatisfyed y^t^ they hear of no more, for he had 200 lb. & more with him in mony & drew a bill of 50 lb. & nothing but y^e^ land appears y^t^ cost but 70 or 80 pounds y^t^ country mony. perticulerly know how—N. Hage makes good his debts he said Acred owed him.

I have had a long lettr from thy Brother Charles. has not been well, is better, son not yet married. intends for Pennsilvania, but is unresolved, as to time. I must [illegible] him. Thy Bro: John has most kindly visited me, as also his wife myn, & we returned their kindness; he has had a bad cold; but thou wilt hear from him thy selfe.

Dear Thomas, 'tis a time to show thy skill & friendship to me, & w^ch^ is more to truthes interest in me. blessed are they y^t^ are not offended; but have patience & endure. the Lord god of Abraham, of Isaac & of Jacob be with you, in counsel & righteousness, & by his presence own you & by his power defend you a vineyard to his praise who is over all, blessed for ever.

Now dearly salute me to dear friends in their meetings & perticulerly to dear John Simcock Christopher Tayler, and J. Harrison. also salute me to J. Claypole, S. Janney, W^m.^ Yardly, Tho. Brasly, W^m.^ Wood, Tho: Ellis, J. Songhurst, John Moon, J. Blunston, Jos. Growden, J. Head, G. Jones, G. Painter, H. Lewis, J. Howell, Jo. B [blank] and the rest of Welch frds. Cap^t.^ Owen if there. my love to S. Fitzwater, B. Wilcocks, J. Barns, J. Goodson, Tho. Crossman[?], poor widdow fincher, W^m.^ Salloway, J. Alloway. R. Wade, R. Turner, Sam. Carpenter, honest J. Southern, W. Clark with their famelys, & all frds on our side & the other too. Perticulerly J. Gosling An. Jinnings, S. bud[?], W. Biddle, S. Cooper, R. Stacy & Maland[?], G. Lambert widdow Welch Salute me to D^r.^ More, whos father I am perswadeing to send him a carpenter & an husbandman. & be kind to him, to J. Can, A. Man, P. Aldricks, W. Guest, J. White, W^m^. Purvall.

Salute me to the Sweeds, Capt. Cock old Pet. Cock & Rambo & their sons y^e^ Swansons, Andr. Binckson, P. Yoakham & ye rest of them. their Ambassador here dined with me to'ther day.

Talbot is to come home in the ketch, & another is ordered thither in y^e^ same errand. he will be tryed by court martiall. the late King is said to have dyed a Papist, & this had declared himselfe & goes openly to mass w^th^ his Queen.

Pray lett no bonds be taken in my name for entering & clearing according to law, but in y^e^ Kings, being in persuance of his english acts; but thos of good behaviour in y^e^ country may; relating to us only. also exact coppys should be kept of ships certificates from ye [torn] does give bond, & sent yearly let ther French, Scotch or Dutch vessels may carry passengers with their furniture & means of subsistance theither, but not trade there; only take y^e^ bonds of thos y^t^ come, to answear to y^e^ King if called upon, the custom, y^e^ same goods would have paid it [?] out of england for we were thought superarogatory in y^e^ Alexander of Inverness. but keep this privat, I mean, only to y^e^ prudent selves. therefore let y^e^ poor french have their vessell. an affidavid, y^t^ they brought only passengers & poor furniture. no traffick. read y^e^ law.

If any people come upon the [illegible] to settle, pleas them w^t^ you can, & lett thos y^t^ have to spare, sell reasonably rather then not keep them. 'tis people regulated does all to a Country.

pray gett ye refusal of three or four farms about 20 in Silver & 80 lb. in good goods. Such will be had: some are comeing y^t^ begin so. Widdow finchers if to be sold, may to advantage over y^e^ water.

I hope you entertained Jackson of Irland kindly; many are comeing. Capt. Markham will have the Leuet^es^ place. he writes well & is ingenuous, & promisses me industry. pray keep thy station, & he (I hope) will know his. he has both my and ye Goverm^ts^ business that he may have bread. he wants no witt, has an ingenuous woman lately married. will live quietly & reserv'd. thou may advise w^th^ him, he wants no business, & has been mortified to labour & saveing. & has been usefull to me since I came. as I see how P.L. behaves him selfe I may preferr him when I come. he must now give place he has had meat,

drink & lodging two years almost, y^e^ materialls of his office out of my store, & y^e^ proffit of his place to him selfe. Keep up y^e^ peoples hearts & love what thou canst. I hope to be w^th^ them next fall, if y^e^ lord prevent not. I long to be w^th^ you. no temptations prevale to fix me here. the Lord send us a good meeting, Amen. I am

Thy very true &
Affect. friend

WILLIAM PENN

Dearly give my love to thy Patience, and dearly give my love to thy daughters & sons. to El. Clapole, S. Car. wife, S. Goodson, S. Moore, M. Songhurst, M. Beuman[?], Joan Jones, lidia Wade. my wife & children I bless y^e^ Lord are well, & she sends you all her love.

Quaker Research in Progress

The following list of current or recent studies in Quaker history continues the series of such notices appearing from time to time in the BULLETIN. It is of course improbable that the list is complete; but it is interesting as showing where the present frontiers of Quaker research are.

Information concerning other Quaker studies in progress but not published should be sent to Henry J. Cadbury, Chairman of the Committee on Historical Research, 7 Buckingham Place, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

W. A. Alsobrook, Andover, New Jersey. "The Mysticism of Rufus M. Jones." Drew University; History and Philosophy of Religion, thesis for Ph.D. degree. Research commenced.

Bickley Burns Brodhead, 197 Lexington Avenue, Lansdowne, Pennsylvania. "The Relationship between the Historic Jesus and the Christ Within in Early Quakerism, Fox through Penn." (Treats the manner in which Quaker thinking on the Christological question was influenced by the pressures of the age and within the Society of Friends). Columbia University; Philosophy, thesis for the M.A. degree, 1948. Completed.

Molly E. Burgess, 6, Combe Lane, Whitely Village, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey, England. "Barbados in the 17th Century." (A history of the foundation and development of that island —once the home of many Friends). Thesis for a teacher's diploma, 1949.

Maurice Creasey, 42, Whirlow Lane, Sheffield, England. "The Theology of Robert Barclay." (An examination of the influence on Barclay of contemporary Protestant Scholasticism). Leeds University; Theology, thesis for B.D. degree, 1950.

Lawrence Darton, The Cottage, Pytt's Lane, Burford, Oxon., England. "The Beacon Controversy." (Editing a letter by Maria Hack describing her baptism by Isaac Crewdson in 1837.)

Daniel N. Hoffman, 420 Riverside Drive, New York 25, N. Y. "The Religious Motivation behind the Work of the American Friends Service Committee and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee." (Deals only with foreign relief and rehabilitation work, primarily in the post-World War II period.) Haverford College; Biblical Literature, Philosophy, thesis for M.A. degree, 1949 or 1950. Near completion.

Babette May Levy, 600 West 116th Street, New York 27, N.Y. "Seventeenth-Century Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies." (Puritanism is defined in the wider sense, to include all non-conformist influences.) To be published in 1950 by the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Alma Lutz, 22 River Street, Boston 8, Massachusetts. A biography of Susan B. Anthony against the background of American history. To be published in 1950.

Martha Marcussen, Skovvej 18, Gentofte, Denmark. "History of the Danish Society of Friends." (An account of the beginnings of Quakerism in Denmark and the life of the Society of Friends there, based on old minute books supported by the memory of two surviving Friends who knew the early Danish Quakers.) To be published in Copenhagen in 1950.

Rev. J. MacBeath Miller, 10140 119th Street, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. "The Roots and Development of John Wesley's Organization." (With special reference to the debt of Methodism to Quakerism.) Edinburgh University; Divinity, thesis for Ph.D. degree, 1949. In preparation.

Richard L. Morton, 116 Chandler Court, Williamsburg, Virginia. The record of three teachers (Margaret Newbolt Thorpe, Martha Haynes, and Elizabeth Pennock) sent by Philadelphia Friends to teach at Williamsburg just after the Civil War. To be published in 1950. Nearly completed.

Carol Murphy, Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pennsylvania. "History of Pendle Hill." To be published in 1950. Nearly completed.

Richard F. O'Dell, 103 Thompson Street, Kalamazoo, Michigan. "The Early Antislavery Movement in Ohio." (Thesis carries the story to about 1830; research being continued to about 1845 in anticipation of publication.) University of Michigan; History, thesis for Ph.D. degree.

Elizabeth I. Shanks, 1118 West Bland Street, Canton, Missouri. "The Quaker Administration of the Northern Superintendency under Grant's Peace Policy." University of Missouri; History, thesis for M.A. degree.

Bradshaw Snipes, Lincoln Highway, Morrisville, Pennsylvania. "Friends' Relations with the Seneca Indians, 1838-1850." (The story of the fraudulent sale of Indian land and Friends' help in reclaiming it, the evolution in the Senecas' civilization, and the opposition to the Friends.) Haverford College; History, thesis for M.A. degree, 1949. Completed.

Albert J. Wahl, R.D. 1, Wilmington Pike, West Chester, Pennsylvania. "The Congregational or Progressive Friends in the Pre-Civil-War Reform Movement." (The origin and extension of the Progressive Friends' reform movement, with special attention to the Longwood Meeting at Old Kennett, Pennsylvania.) Temple University; History, thesis for Ed.D. degree. Research commenced.

Margaret Fay Williams, 1 Montpelier Terrace, Swansea, South Wales. "The Society of Friends in Glamorganshire, 1654-1900." University of Wales; History, thesis for M.A. degree, 1950.

James W. Wolfenden, 21 Walnut Street, Bristol, Connecticut. "The Social Movement in English Nonconformity, 1880-1914." (Friends considered as one of the groups in which the development of a new social criticism was most marked.) Yale University; History, thesis for Ph.D. degree. In preparation.

News of the Association

THE SPRING Meeting of Friends Historical Association was held on Saturday, May 21, 1949, at Pennsbury Manor, the reconstructed country estate of William Penn in what is now Tullytown on the Delaware River. By decision of the Board of Directors no formal program was arranged. It was a fine Spring day and members of the Association and their guests enjoyed the opportunity of walking about the beautifully landscaped grounds. In the mansion itself, recently furnished with appropriate period pieces, Walter Johnson, Floyd S. Platt, and Charles Henry Moon acted most acceptably and knowledgeably as *cicerones*. These three Friends, all members of Friends Historical Association, have been closely associated with the reconstruction and furnishing of historic Pennsbury. A box supper at nearby Fallsington meetinghouse completed the afternoon's program; coffee and ice cream were furnished and served by local Friends.

* * *

The Spring Number of the BULLETIN carried an announcement of a plan to raise a sum of money to purchase a microfilm reader for the Library of the Society of Friends at Friends House in London. It is gratifying to report that over five hundred dollars was contributed by forty-one members of the Association and that the sum has been forwarded to London. A memorial to Rufus M. Jones, the reading machine will be a useful instrument in furthering research in a field in which our beloved Quaker historian made so rich a contribution.

Book Reviews

Margaret Fell: Mother of Quakerism. By Isabel Ross. London: Longmans, Green, & Company. 1949. xvi, 421 pages. 21s (American price: $4.50).

IT IS a great pleasure to welcome this book so long looked forward to. Reading its well-packed pages carried me back to the year 1937, when with my husband and son I spent a week at Swarthmoor Hall in the delightful company of my friend Isabel Ross and her husband Macgregor Ross and their two sons. Every day we went out on a trip among the lakes and fells, in the most beautiful scenery which England can provide. Sometimes we hired a rowboat and went out on the lakes, seeing from there better than anywhere "the changing colors of the hills." At other periods we rested in the garden gay with flowers of Swarthmoor Hall, or roamed about its historic interior, or sat and listened to Isabel's stories of her great ancestress. One day she took us into Judge Fell's study, a room so much used later by Margaret Fell's second husband George Fox, and there, sitting down in state, she gave to us the little lecturette which she was accustomed to give to inquiring visitors at Swarthmoor Hall. This was the germ of the coming book. The project of writing the life of her ancestress was already something to which Isabel Ross looked forward and for which she was beginning to collect material, both in going through family manuscripts and in absorbing, by day-to-day living, the atmosphere of Swarthmoor Hall itself. Now the book has been completed, and printed and published, and the pages, so full of the facts of the earliest history of Quakerism, must of necessity find a home on many a Quaker bookshelf and in every Quaker library.

Isabel Ross shared or exemplified the vitality of her ancestor. Long residence in Africa, in the Kenya colony, where her husband had a most responsible position in the Civil Service under the British crown, had in no way depleted her sparkle and her love of doing. When the pleasant life at Swarthmoor Hall was in full swing, one of her little boys was asked what he would like to be when he grew up. He replied with perspicacity—"A retired civil servant!"

The making of Swarthmoor Hall into the family home was a very happy thought. Visitors were admitted at almost all hours and shown about, but the house was by no means a showplace in the ordinary sense of the word, and Macgregor and Isabel Ross inhabited it in the same spirit in which Judge Fell and his wife had inhabited it in days gone by. That phase passed with Judge Fell.

One enters, in the pages of the book itself, the gray, overcast weather of the early days of Quakerism. Forbidden meetings, ruptures

with neighbors, arrests, imprisonments, and separations make up the story. Margaret Fell appears once more as a woman of strong character, dominant, downright and lacking in tact (see her letter to Colonel Kirkby on page 168) but a tower of strength to the new sect. She irritated her fast-living son, but she ruled her daughters. They were terrible little prigs. It is amusing to read of their eight and nine year old extravagancies in the way of fasts and of their solemn rebukes of the local priest. The fasting incidents are absent from this book; but it was clearly a life of excessive strain. The mysterious personality of Fox, with his extraordinary magnetism, swayed them all, in his absence (most usual) as much as in his presence (most rare); and after marriage as before, his wife's relationship to him seems mainly that of chief disciple. It was not a romance, it was a dignified and deliberate partnership.

The author stands at a respectful distance from her main characters, Margaret and George Fox, and makes no effort to present them in their human complexity. Her concern is to provide, with the aid of much fresh research, all possible relevant facts in chronological order. So the characters remain, as before, somewhat inhuman, a little supernatural, divided from ourselves by time, by habits of thought and cloudy turns of speech, and we admire them without a sense of emulation. They appear to be too different from us in outlook, in their whole handling of life, and in their concept of happiness. This is what it means to be founders of a sect.

But what we of the Society of Friends today owe to Margaret Fell, and her uncompromising integrity to the faith, is simply incalculable. "I told them," she said about her first trial before the justices, "I should not deny my faith and principles, for anything they could do against me; and while it pleased the Lord to let me have a house, I would endeavor to worship him in it."

A woman Quaker could write to her from imprisonment in Banbury jail, "Thou has been strength unto me when I was weak, and pure refreshment have I found in thy presence."

Even more than Margaret Fell's abundant hospitality to Friends and meetings, and her immense output of exhortation and advice in letters, she gave the struggling Society new lifeblood in her organizing of a fund for traveling Friends and for Friends in prison.

The point of view of this book is similar to that of the previous life, *Margaret Fell of Swarthmoor Hall* by Helen Crosfield (published in 1913). The colorful background of the stormy times, and the reasons that lay therein for the persecution of Quakers, is not very much dealt with. The world of the seventeenth century in England is divided into "the good"—the Quakers—and "the bad"—their persecutors. One would be interested to see an account of the rise of Quakerism in which

the leaders of Quakerism, while sympathetically portrayed for us, their followers, might also be perceived in relation to their fellow countrymen. Had not the authorities some case for suspecting the seeds of fresh revolution in every unauthorized gathering? The refusal of Friends to take the oath of allegiance certainly laid them open to suspicion, and was very generally misunderstood. Margaret Fell's treatment of the oath, by the way, is among the best on record, and I would gladly have sacrificed a few of the many printed letters to have that dialogue at her trial given in full.

But this is only to carp in the midst of plenty. The book is a mine of information, carefully documented and well indexed.

Westtown, Pennsylvania Janet Whitney

Edward Burrough of Underbarrow. By Elisabeth Brockbank, R.M.S. London: The Bannisdale Press. 1949. 176 pages. 7s. 6d.

Elisabeth Brockbank, who twenty years ago provided us with a modern appreciation of Richard Hubberthorne, has now written and illustrated a companion volume on Edward Burrough (1634-1662) of Underbarrow. It is much briefer than the memoir of Burrough published by W. and T. Evans in the fourteenth volume of *Friends' Library* in 1850. But it is much more digestible for the modern reader and contains, as did the author's earlier Quaker biography, an artistic background of nature and history with which she is familiar. We have thus another welcome treatment of a first-generation Publisher of Truth. Will not someone oblige by doing a similar piece of modernization for Gilbert Latey, the London Quaker haberdasher?

Our present author does not publish such long documents as did the Evans brothers, but she prints enough to show what an especially valiant member this north-country man was of Ernest E. Taylor's "Valiant Sixty". Rejected as a lad by his parents, he became the junior partner in the well-known gospel team of Howgill and Burrough, whose special field of activity was London itself, with Ireland and Bristol not forgotten. Burrough was an indefatigable writer on doctrine as well as a preacher of repentance. One of his most important doctrinal statements is printed in the Evans memoir (*Friends' Library*, vol. XIV, pp. 435-446). It is entitled "A Standard lifted up, and an ensign held forth to all nations" in which the principles and testimonies of his Society are set forth with authority. At first an ardent defender of Quakerism in oral and written debate, he became perhaps more gentle and solicitous for his own people as his short life drew to a close. Beside his tender letters to "dear George," he also wrote as a son to Margaret Fell whose house at Swarthmoor served as *poste restante* for the Publishers of Truth—her sons in the faith.

Often in danger, sometimes in prison for preaching, Burrough was finally committed to Newgate where he died of "gaol fever" in 1662 at the age of 28. His arrest was for preaching at the Bull and Mouth, and his later trial was just such a travesty of justice as was that of Penn and Mead a few years later. Fined one hundred marks, he was imprisoned for refusal to pay. Thomas Ellwood tells us what Newgate was like. "Twenty-seven Quakers died or contracted fatal diseases in the prison of London during 1662, and so did many other prisoners," says Elisabeth Brockbank. It is not strange they died. It took courage to be a Quaker leader in those days.

Aside from the pleasure of reading such a well balanced treatment as this of a spiritual forefather, it is profitable for us today to catch from these Quakers of the first decade the message of faith, love and unshakeable fortitude which they send us over the radio of time. They lived very near to the Spirit of God. It was their main business to do so.

Haverford College W. W. COMFORT

The Wisdom of John Woolman: With a Selection from His Writings as a Guide to the Seekers of Today. By Reginald Reynolds. Preface by Stephen Hobhouse. London: George Allen & Unwin. 1948. xii, 178 pages. $2.00.

REGINALD REYNOLDS has tackled a job that every Quaker would find throughly worth doing. He has rediscovered and reread the *Journal* and other writings of John Woolman. He has culled out his own set of favorite quotations. And, most stimulating of all, he has put down in writing his own evaluation of the importance of John Woolman's insights for our troubled day. If each of us would actually do that we might have some healthy discussion on a few controversial points but, much more important and much more certain, we would each one of us have, as Reginald Reynolds had himself, an almost electrifyingly fresh realization that "Here is THE Answer, still for today!"

Thirty years ago the American Friends Service Committee published a report largely written by Jesse Holmes for an All-Friends Conference which started off with a ringing affirmation that the Quaker message, if it meant anything, meant a faith in the availability of Divine Guidance to instruct the mind and cultivate the spirit in a measure adequate to all our needs.

Such was the faith of John Woolman. Such will be the faith, I am convinced, of almost any individual who is willing today to read and meditate upon the writings of this remarkable 18th-century tailor and shopkeeper. John Woolman's writings are so convincing, so timeless and yet so timely, that all that is necessary is for people to be persuaded

to read them. This conviction so gripped Reginald Reynolds that he has written this book in the hope of stimulating many more to read the original. I *hope* it does. I can't say that I think the style and make-up of this new book are particularly conducive to that end (not so much so, for example, as Janet Whitney's *John Woolman, American Quaker*) but Reginald Reynolds has done an excellent job of selecting representative quotations—almost a hundred of them, and including nine out of ten of my own favorite quotations selected several years ago! More important, he has done a very stimulating job of pointing up their own pointedness for our own trials and tribulations today.

Still today "selfishness being indulged in clouds the understanding!" Still today "through the desire of money men are tempted at times to deal hardly with their neighbors." Still today "the seeds of war have nourishment in these our possessions."

It is also true still today that "how deeply soever men are involved in the most exquisite difficulties, sincerity of heart and upright walking before God, freely submitting to His providence, is the most sure remedy . . . . Divine love, which enlarges the heart toward mankind universally, is that alone which can rightly stop every corrupt stream and open those channels of business and commerce where nothing runs that is not pure."

Reginald Reynolds comments on the contemporary appropriateness of both John Woolman's "approach" to social problems and his "conclusions." His approach was extremely individualistic, accosting slave-owning Friends, for example, with love and sympathy rather than antagonizing condemnation. His "conclusions" were revolutionary: as Reginald Reynolds points out, he would have rejected the institution of colonial imperialism, if not capitalism itself, as completely as he rejected slavery. Certainly he would have rejected the urbanization, mechanization, and commercialism of much of our life today.

Perhaps the most controversial of all Reginald Reynolds' observations is his belief that John Woolman still today would have rejected political action as inevitably requiring compromise and disunity in favor of a fervent and individualistic teaching by example of a social gospel that does not divide but unites, that takes its kingdom (as James Nayler affirmed) "with entreaty and not with contention, and keeps it by lowliness of mind."

Certainly there is still today a likelihood that John Woolman is right, but if we who call ourselves Quakers today are to affirm it persuasively, we must do a much more recognizable job of turning all that we possess, as John Woolman did, into the channel of universal love.

Moorestown, New Jersey David S. Richie

A Narrative of Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, With Some Account of Springfield, Whitemarsh and Cheltenham Townships in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. By Horace Mather Lippincott. Chestnut Hill: The author. 1948. 190 pages. $3.00.

HORACE Mather Lippincott has written a modest-sized book with a long title which is likely to be known, conversationally, as his "book about Chestnut Hill." In it he has assembled an extraordinary number of facts about the past and the present, some of them well-known and some of fresh interest, particularly to those who live, work, or worship in this community. He gives credit to the historical research and writings of various other persons, particularly John MacFarlane, but much of the "bright cloth" with which he has enlivened the facts is the result of his own appreciative conversation with living persons who know both traditions and current life and problems.

Chestnut Hill, he says, is the highest point between Trenton and Bryn Mawr. It was probably a wilderness as late as 1710; the name appears in a deed of 1711 from Thomas Fairman "to Peter Wentz, Chestnut Hill, Germantown"; in 1734 the old Germantownship was divided into Germantown and Crisheim, the latter comprising what is now Chestnut Hill.

Chapters on Inns and Railroads, Churches, and Schools compress into short space a combination of current information and historical tidbits. The author's interest in, and knowledge about, the Religious Society of Friends runs through the book, with accounts of meetings and individuals. The chapter on Cricket and Horses tells of two interests which were particularly lively in Chestnut Hill in the past but which have declined in recent years. In this connection he quotes a nostalgic and perhaps provocative passage from Dr. Cornelius Weygandt, beginning "the heyday of American life was a hundred years ago; there has been retrogression from that day to this in the will to work, in taste, in manners, in cultivation, in the sense of honor."

The middle section of the book consists of twenty-eight pages of photographs of persons and places and events, a varied and interesting collection. Each chapter is charmingly headed by an appropriate line drawing, presumably a reproduction. One wishes that the author, in spite of his declared distaste for elaborate documentation, had somewhere told us their source. Also, although he has written for his own enjoyment and that of his reader, one feels that the latter might have found his pleasure and profit increased by a good index, in a book in which so many bits of information jostle one another.

Germantown, Pennsylvania D. ROBERT AND ELIZABETH YARNALL

Joseph Lister: The Friend of Man. By Hector Charles Cameron. London: William Heinemann. 1948. vii, 180 pages. 17s. 6d.

JOSEPH LISTER was the doctor in England who first began to see the significance in surgery of Pasteur's pioneer work with molds and bacteria. He accepted the theory that causes of inflammation in operative or accidental wounds might be invisible spores or germs floating in the air. He saw the probable meaning of the statistical fact that surgical wounds one by one in separate homes had a much better chance to escape infection than similar wounds in the hospitals of those days where there were already septic cases closely crowded. His first successful attempts were to protect wounds from contaminations through the air. He and others later sensed the importance of antisepsis by chemicals or heat for all instruments or materials that might make or touch wounds. His scientific achievements are well set forth in good biographies and are part of western medical history, known everywhere. This book attempts to go into his home and illuminate his personal and private life.

Quaker readers will be interested to know that he was born into a well-to-do Quaker family and kept throughout his life a close association with his father and relatives, though in early manhood he resigned from the Society. Even a medical education was hard to get for a Friend in those days. Matriculation at all medical schools but one, the University College of London, required adherence to the Church of England. We get a picture of an earnest, enthusiastic student, too sensitive and overconscientious. At one stage, his college career was interrupted by what might in these days be called a nervous breakdown. His formal separation from Friends he accomplished by resigning, because he wished to marry a non-Friend and would have been disowned. The wife he chose was a charming and accomplished woman whose partnership increased immeasurably the effectiveness of his teaching and research.

Written by the son of one of Lister's friends and co-workers, this book draws largely from letters and stories dated during his life. Debate, controversy, even slander and invective are recorded in the medical literature of the time. Here we find the painful reactions of a gentle, sensitive, non-aggressive research scientist, hurt by the criticism of less scientific, sometimes highly commercial surgeons of his day. People tried to copy his procedures without having grasped his guiding principles, then failed to duplicate his results, and said he was wrong or worse. His real character is clearly indicated by the unusual interest and loyalty his students developed. His early years of teaching were in Glasgow or Edinburgh, and many students came there from the continent. It is interesting to see how recognition, imitation and acclaim developed faster in Germany, France, and Austria, until continental surgeons and scientists helped push London into accepting his work.

The book adds appreciably to our knowledge of his human side, his frailties and disappointments. Most of all, perhaps, it pictures clearly his meticulous, never-finished preparation for his beloved lecturing. He rarely condensed, or stopped on time, so some program committees learned to give him a whole session, and not schedule other papers. This is hardly a great book, though about a great man.

Glen Mills, Pennsylvania LOVETT DEWEES, M. D.

Sweeper In the Sky: The Life of Maria Mitchell. By Helen Wright. New York: Macmillan. 1949. 253 pages. $4.00.

HELEN WRIGHT has rescued a very strong-minded, able, nineteenth-century American woman from the banal sentimentalities of the Victorian era in which she has been enmeshed previously. Maria Mitchell (1818-1889), the first great American astronomer and first woman college professor in the United States, was the daughter of William and Lydia (Coleman) Mitchell, both one-time clerks of Nantucket Monthly Meeting of Friends. Born of a unique Quaker stock whose characteristics were "startling directness, forthright truthfulness, independence, even eccentricity, and above all the humor that made all these traits palatable," Maria Mitchell was disowned in 1837 for doubting the existence of a future state. Despite her alienation from the organized Society of Friends, she incorporated in her life the best Quakerism had to offer in painstaking care in observation and in devotion to experiential truth in the area of science. Recognized internationally for her astronomical discoveries, Maria Mitchell traveled twice in Europe and twice extensively in the United States, and finished her years as a rugged individualist on the Vassar College faculty. Her fame carried her into the circle of the great and near great in both continents.

Helen Wright's narrative is delightfully authentic. Original source materials are used throughout. Perhaps the best chapters are those which catch the flavor of whale oil in Nantucket's halcyon days. The Quaker background, crabbed and narrowly puritanical as it was in the nineteenth century, still evokes sympathetic and truly understanding treatment. *Sweeper in the Sky* combines the readable qualities of a good novel with real care for truth, a quality which both Maria Mitchell and our Quaker fellowship have cherished. Not only has an important woman come alive but light has been shed on New England Quakerism in the trying days of the separations.

Salem College ROBERT J. LEACH

Geraldine . Cadbury, 1865-1941. By Janet Whitney. London: George G. Harrap and Co. 1948. 200 pages. 12s. (American price: $3.50).

Janet Whitney's sixth book, the biography of Geraldine S. Cadbury (1865-1941), is a vivid account of a "vitality-giving" person. Through the skillfully gathered material and Janet Whitney's lively comments and evaluations, we are privileged to follow an intense and abundant experience both private and public.

Warmhearted and impulsive, Geraldine Cadbury gave herself without reserve to her home, her meeting, and the underprivileged children of Birmingham. Hers was the kind of light that cannot be kept under a bushel.

In her husband, Barrow Cadbury, head of the great Cadbury firm, the cocoa works at Bournville, she found the most complete sympathy and the refreshment of mutual fun. Discipline was no problem in their family. She was the kind of person whom you naturally wanted to please.

To her meeting she contributed the expertness which comes from the individual's willingness to devote real attention to this exacting service. By her city she early found herself "fastened to a career." This public life-work included promoting the development of a children's court, the building and equipping of a detention home, an open-air school, observation centers, short-term schools, and a hostel for young offenders. Health measures also claimed her attention.

To make a delinquent child into a good citizen was the objective. Mrs. Cadbury saw the best accomplished through the family, even in a generation when the family was "losing its grip on society." For all children she coveted the security which her own children had in "the vibrant unity" of their family group.

"To infiltrate stubborn magistrates with new ideas" was a steady challenge to her charm and tact. Finally, her retirement, five years before her death, from the magistrate's bench of the children's court enabled her "to knit up her work so that it should not unravel."

Janet Whitney shows here as ably and clearly as she did in her *Elizabeth Fry* how religious zeal gives power to a non-professional service. She also emphasizes the democratic effort to bring long-range improvement by rousing the sense of responsibility of the ordinary people.

Because of her large resources in wealth and influence, Mrs. Cadbury could set to work with all the joy of a creator. With full public approval she could outstrip the city's action in supplying facilities for reform. The government's recognition of her achievement came in

the form of a title of honor. But best of all, Janet Whitney makes us feel that throughout Dame Geraldine's self-assumed responsibilities, however arduous they became, she carried joyousness with her.

Pendle Hill ANNA BRINTON

Briefer Notices

By HENRY J. CADBURY

Biographies of recent conservative Friends are few. One such is *Memorial to Cyrus Cooper and Bertha A. Cooper*, prepared and published by their son Samuel Cooper (Moorestown, New Jersey, 1948, 202 pages). Cyrus Cooper (1860-1940) had a varied life in Pennsylvania and Ohio and traveled in the ministry both there and in North Carolina and Canada. This tribute of filial piety contains mostly extracts first from his reminiscences and then from his letters and diary. Externally the life was not remarkable, but its inner self-conscious piety is brought out sympathetically.

* * *

C. W. Trow reports an excavation carried out in 1946 by the Felsted School Historical Society of "The 'Quakers' Mount,' Bannister Green, Felsted" (*The Essex Review* [England], 57, 1948, 100-103). The evidence is not conclusive, but it seems that the small mound is probably rightly named and was the scene of Quaker burials such as are mentioned in the Felsted Parish Church Register between 1679 and 1732 as "among the Quakers" or "at the Quakers Hill (or Mount)." More than 25 such entries are quoted, supplied by C. Brightwen Rowntree.

* * *

A finely illustrated article entitled "A Day with the Quakers" and describing the meetings, the Barnesville Boarding School and the Walton Home for elderly Friends was published in the Pictorial Magazine of the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* for May 1, 1949.

* * *

Fully fifteen Friends meetinghouses or their sites are included among the 900 church properties described by Frank R. Zebley in *The Churches of Delaware* (Wilmington, 1947). Each church or former church is provided with a brief history. Among the hundreds of excellent illustrations are pictures of the following Friends meetinghouses opposite the pages noted: Wilmington (12), Center (136), Appoquinimink (186), Camden (222). This book is all the more welcome since the WPA Directory of Churches and Religious Organizations in Delaware (1942) was so very inadequate.

"The Quaker Calendar" by Samuel G. Barton in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 93 (1949), 32-39, is a long, somewhat elaborate discussion of the beginning date of the early Quaker year. The author's evidence is much of it for March 1 rather than for March 25, and that is his main contention. The topic is full of pitfalls as he shows consciously and sometimes unconsciously. As an example of the latter I may note that the date of Nayler's letter, "30th of the 8th month, 1652," which he calls "the earliest illustration of the avoidance of heathen names by the Quakers, which I have found" (p. 37 f.), was printed in 1653 in a tract of Nayler's as *October* and evidently was corrected to the Quaker manner by 1694 for the *Journal* of George Fox, whence Barton quotes it.

* * *

The Rotches, by John M. Bullard (New Bedford, 1947, 583 pages) is a large and somewhat indigestible compilation from which may be obtained a great deal of information about a famous Quaker family, including the branches of New Bedford and Nantucket, of Dunkirk in France, and of Newhaven in England, as well as those of Ohio, Illinois and the West Coast. William Rotch, Sr. (1734-1828) was perhaps the most famous as a Friend, Eliza Rotch Farrar (1791-1870) as an author, Aunt Mary Rotch (1777-1848) as the friend of Emerson. The first part of the book includes sketches of over a dozen of the more notable members of the family. The second part quotes memoranda, letters and journals written by the Rotches themselves. The third part is a systematic genealogy. There are many illustrations and an index of names.

* * *

In welcoming the new Quaker quarterly from Scandinavia, *Nordisk Kvâkar Tidskrift*, we note especially the series of articles on the Quaker history of the four countries, beginning with one on Norway by Ole F. Olden (vol. 1, no. 1, 1949, 6-13, and followed by one on Denmark by Inger Clausen and Thyra S. Folke (vol. 1, no. 2, 1949, 5-11).

* * *

Albert W. Werline's *Problems of Church and State in Maryland during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (South Lancaster, Mass.: The College Press, 1948, 235 pages) contains, as is to be expected of such books, frequent reference, based on official proceedings, to the treatment given the Quakers in the early colonial period as well as in the formation of the state constitution.

* * *

Arlin Turner relates how "Whittier Calls on George W. Cable" in the *New England Quarterly*, 22 (1949), 92-96, largely on the basis of a reporter's account in the Boston *Herald*. As to others whom he met, Whittier gave Cable a copy of his edition of John Woolman's *Journal*.

An uncollected poem of Whittier's is contributed to the same *Quarterly* (p. 96 f.) by Joseph Doyle.

The *London Quarterly Review* prints in two instalments (Oct., 1948, 312-323, and July, 1949, 239-248) an article by Frank Baker on "Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism." It extends up to John Wesley's death in 1791 and quotes more from Methodist than from Quaker sources. The relations were not always unfriendly, and often appear to be parallel.

* * *

How far one should mention here items useful for Quaker background is doubtful. However, one is justified evidently in mentioning Charles F. Mullett's article, "Toleration and Persecution in England, 1660-1689," in *Church History*, 18 (1949), 18-43, dealing with the ecclesiastical and political development, rather than with the legal position of English Protestant Dissenters, on which the same author wrote at length in the *Virginia Law Review* both for the same period (22, 1936, 495-526) and for later times (*ibid*, 23, 1937, 389-418; 25, 1939, 671-697). A more inclusive article by the same author entitled "Protestant Dissent as a Crime" (1660-1828) is published in *The Review of Religion*, 13 (1949), 339-353. It is a fine summary of the slow process by which England finally got rid of the Clarendon Code under which the Quakers suffered more disabilities than any other dissenters.

* * *

Rebecca Foster Reeve and her brothers Clayton and Robert were evidently "Orthodox" Friends from Medford, N. J. They were children of Mark Reeve and were living in East Tennessee when they joined the gold rush to California in 1849, going nearly half the way by flatboat. Clayton was killed by Indians on the Pit River, California; Robert died in Nevada in 1863; and Rebecca (who had married Dr. John D. Scott) in San José in 1881. Eight letters written to their relatives in Medford, describing these events and especially the journey westward and early conditions, are of more than usual value. They have been edited by an expert, Oscar O. Winther, and published under the title, "From Tennessee to California in 1849: Letters of the Reeve Family of Medford, New Jersey," in *The Journal of the Rutgers University Library* 11 (1948), 33-84.

* * *

Earl Gregg Swem contributes to the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* for 1948 (58, 1949, 17-190) an article, "Brothers of the Spade: Correspondence of Peter Collinson of London and of John Custis, of Williamsburg, Virginia, 1734-1746." About forty letters, chiefly on botanical matters, are published with notes and index. They are derived from the Custis letter book and the original Collinson letters at the library of the Antiquarian Society at Worcester, Mass. About another twenty are missing from the series. The editor adds considerable biographical information about Collinson and his American Quaker correspondent, John Bartram. Evidently full biographies of each of

these Friends are much needed, as this extended contribution well indicates.

* * *

For the first time in many years a really careful and conscientious biography of the first Quaker first lady has appeared. *Dolly Madison, Her Life and Times,* by Katharine Anthony (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1949, 426 pages) deals faithfully with her Quaker conformity and non-conformity and corrects many errors of the impressionistic biographers.

* * *

A broadcast from the B. B. C. Welsh Regional Station by Jonathan Lloyd, Clerk of the General Meeting for Wales, has been published in pamphlet form in Welsh and in English (1947, 8 pages). The titles are respectively: *Y Crynwyr yng Nghymru* and *The Quakers in Wales.* It is an excellent summary of nearly three centuries.

* * *

Charles Roll contributes to the *Indiana Magazine of History* a discursive paper on "The Quaker in Anglo-American Cultural Relations," 45 (1949), 135-46. He indicates that "the Quaker in America has been on the giving as well as on the receiving end of this transit of civilization."

* * *

Giovanni Pioli has issued as a 48-page pamphlet the introduction to his proposed annotated translation into Italian of the *Journal* of George Fox. It is entitled *Giorgio Fox e la Relegione laica degli "Amici,"* and is issued on the tercentenary of the origin of the movement as a contribution to the formation of a free religious conscience. It reviews the salient features of Quakerism from Fox to the present day.

* * *

The New England Historical and Genealogical Register, 103 (1949), 231-3, prints fifteen testimonies of disownment for members who acted contrary to Quaker pacifism between 1775-1784 taken by Mrs. Oliver W. Cushman "From Friends Records at Portsmouth." The spirit of the D.A.R. appears to find here glory in what others have rejected.

* * *

Seventeenth Century Maryland: a Bibliography, compiled by Elizabeth Baer and sumptuously published by the John Work Garrett Library (Baltimore, 1949, 218 pages, 180 illustrations) contains data on many Quaker items which make as much as the slightest mention of Maryland.

* * *

Ninety Bits of North Carolina Biography by Charles Hunter Hamlin (1946) includes two or three pages each on Levi Coffin (53-5), Nereus Mendenhall (102-4) and Rufus P. King (106-7).

The historical lecture delivered by Henry J. Cadbury at the 251st session of North Carolina Yearly Meeting in August, 1948, has been published as a pamphlet by North Carolina Friends Historical Society. It is entitled "The Church in the Wilderness: North Carolina Quakerism as Seen by Visitors," citing original impressions recorded each half century between 1698 and 1948 and commenting on the changes in Quakerism's meaning and motives.

* * *

The memory of *Leyton Richards (1879-1948)* is fittingly recalled by appreciations from several sources in a 25-page booklet issued apparently by Carrs Lane Church, Birmingham, England, of which he was pastor from 1924 to 1941. As a pacifist and leader in the Fellowship of Reconciliation, he was long known to Friends before he became Warden at Woodbrooke Settlement, or joined the Society of Friends.

* * *

Jonathan Edwards, Benjamin Franklin, and John Woolman were three contemporary Americans who each left an autobiographical statement of his personal pattern of living. A comparison between them is found where one would hardly look for it, in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors (34, 1948, 364-374). It is by Frank Davidson and is entitled "Three Patterns of Living."

* * *

William Hubben's article on "Ahab, the Whaling Quaker" in *Religion in Life*, 18 (1949), 363-73, is a penetrating study of the hero of Melville's *Moby Dick*, in which the contrast between deeper emotions and the traits of traditional Quakerism is well brought out.

* * *

William Penn provides a title and some of the inspiration for *The Power in the People* by Felix Morley (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1949), a study of the American tradition of liberty and popular rule. The author ascribes to the Society of Friends an influence far out of proportion to its size upon the growth of American political conceptions. He makes effective use of a number of familiar passages from Fox and Penn and twice quotes Hobbes's less familiar observation on the early Friends, that "every boy or wench thought he spoke with God Almighty."

ARTICLES IN QUAKER PERIODICALS

By Lyman W. Riley

Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College

The American Friend

In "Quaker Memorials in Russia" Gilbert McMaster tells of visiting Leningrad in 1930 and seeing near there the graves of the wife and four of the children of Daniel Wheeler.—Feb. 3, 1949, p. 38. (Also in *The Canadian Friend,* Feb., 1949, pp. 6-7).

The Friend (London)

"Bernard Barton, Quaker Poet" by Doris N. Dalglish is an account of a 19th-century Friend, no great poet himself, who was a link between Quakerism and the culture of his day.—Feb. 18, 1949, pp. 127-129.

The Friend (Philadelphia)

Henry J. Cadbury, answering the question, "Why Re-edit Fox's Journal," gives a brief history of its formation and early editions.—May 5, 1949, pp. 355-356.

Henry J. Cadbury's Yearly Meeting lecture, "The Unity of World Quakerism after Three Hundred Years," contains illuminating illustrations of this theme from various fields of Quaker history.—May 19, 1949, pp. 373-376.

"Divisions in the Society of Friends" by William Bacon Evans names and describes briefly fifteen separations.—May 19, 1949, pp. 377-379.

Friends Intelligencer

"Fifty Years of Quakerism in Cuba" by Samuel J. Bunting, Jr., summarizes the story of Friends on the island as told in issues of *El Amigo Cubano.*—Jan. 8, 1949, p. 19.

"Petrus Stuyvesant" (Letter from the Past No. 98), the governor of New Netherlands, was an "inveterate persecutor of Quakers," and therefore the occasion for some interesting episodes in Quaker history.—Jan. 22, 1949, p. 48.

Editorial notice is taken of a Philadelphia exhibition of Edward Hicks' paintings, and comments on his life and art are added.—Feb. 5, 1949, p. 80.

The judges who condemned Charles II of England to death in 1649 were contemporaries of the first Friends. "Now and Then" contrasts the spirit of this execution with Quaker principles; "The Regicides and Others," (Letter from the Past No. 99).—April 30, 1949, pp. 247-248.

Floyd S. Platt, in "Pennsbury Manor, a Memorial," traces the history of the property which William Penn planned for his country home, and gives the story of its restoration as a memorial to him.—May 14, 1949, pp. 272-274.

In Letter from the Past No. 100, "Now and Then" asks, "Why Not, as Well as Why?"—why has history not pursued a different course? In particular, he reflects on why the early Friends were not as radical in economic and political affairs as they were in religion.—May 21, 1949, p. 289.

"Founding Father of Westtown" was George Churchman, who worked for years prior to 1799 to have a school for "guarded education" established. Evidence of his labors is to be found in some letters and a journal which have recently been discovered (Letter from the Past No. 101.)—May 28, 1949, pp. 302-303.

Letter from the Past No. 102 ("On Being Impressed") reproduces two documents of 1748 relating to the imprisonment of a Massachusetts Friend for refusal of military service.—July 23, 1949, p. 409.

"A Letter of Benjamin Hallowell . . ." by Frederick B. Tolles tells of the effort put forth by this Friend to persuade Congress to support President Grant's Indian policy.—July 23, 1949, p. 410.

Edith M. Cooper tells of the building of Prospect Avenue Meeting House, West Grove, Pennsylvania, in a brief article, "History of West Grove Preparative Meeting."—July 30, 1949, p. 422.

"Goethe and the Quakers" by Otto Neuburger shows that the German poet and philosopher had some knowledge and appreciation of Quakerism; in particular, he admired both the work and the personality of Luke Howard, the English Quaker meteorologist.—Aug. 20, 1949, pp. 463-464.

"Now and Then" also calls attention to the correspondence between Luke Howard and Goethe (Letter from the Past No. 103.)—Aug. 20, 1949, pp. 465-466.

The Friends Quarterly

William E. Wilson, in "Rendel Harris, Quaker & Evangelical," the Rendel Harris Lecture for 1948, points out the similarities between Evangelicalism and Quakerism, in particular drawing an interesting comparison between Wesley and Fox.—Oct., 1948, pp. 205-217.

"William Cobbett and Quakers" by Eric Baker is an appreciation of Cobbett's concern for farm laborers, a concern that led him into rather biased and intemperate attacks on Quaker financiers.—Oct., 1948, pp. 249-252.

In "Quaker Children in the Seventeenth Century," L. Hugh Doncaster presents an interesting picture of the spiritual precocity of some of the younger "Publishers of Truth."—Jan., 1949, pp. 48-55.